5-2018

Frontier Capitalism and Unfree Labor in Middle Appalachia: The Development of Western Pennsylvania and Maryland, 1760-1840

Nathaniel Conley
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

Frontier Capitalism and Unfree Labor in Middle Appalachia:
The Development of Western Pennsylvania and Maryland, 1760-1840

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in History

by

Nathaniel Conley
Arkansas State University
Bachelor of Arts in History, 2010
Arkansas State University
Master of Arts in History, 2012

May 2018
University of Arkansas

This dissertation is approved for recommendation to the Graduate Council.

_____
James Gigantino, Ph.D.
Dissertation Director

_____
Caree Banton, Ph.D.
Committee Member

_____
Calvin White, Ph.D.
Committee Member

Abstract

Slavery and unfree labor have been a subject of growing interest for historians, particularly when dealing with frontier areas and the rise of capitalism. Recent studies have shown that slavery and unfree labor existed well into the antebellum period in the North despite the lack of legal support for the institution. Few historians have identified the importance of slavery in the development of western areas, however, particularly in the Appalachian regions of western Pennsylvania and Maryland. As a result, concerted study of slavery in rural, western areas is lacking, particularly in the borderland region between slavery and freedom along the Mason-Dixon Line in the western areas of Pennsylvania and Maryland. "Frontier Capitalism and Unfree Labor in Appalachia: The Development of Western Pennsylvania and Maryland, 1780-1840" remedies this gap by examining this border region, analyzing how various labor systems (slave, free, term slave) affected the development of capitalism and how wider debates over slavery and freedom affected that development.

The period covered is one in which this region underwent dramatic social and economic change, beginning with concerted settlement efforts after the Revolution and the rapid development of a developed economy, stratified society, and hardening racial thought. Beginning in 1780 with the passage of the gradual emancipation act in Pennsylvania, this region was divided by an artificial, political border between slavery and freedom. In theory Pennsylvania developed into a free state but in practice, unfree labor forms existed well into the antebellum period. The Maryland side of this region developed along the same path, quick economic development, social stratification, and hardening racial thought. What is most evident, however, is the quick growth of slavery in this region of the state, despite contrary trends elsewhere in Maryland and the proximity to the border with Pennsylvania. Indeed, sales of

unfree laborers (primarily African Americans), fugitive slaves, and the tensions of being close to the border effected social, political, and racial development on both sides.

Acknowledgements

As with all dissertations, there are too many to list who have helped me. My advisor, Dr. Jim Gigantino, has done more work on my behalf during my stay in the program, from beginning to now, than I have any right to and has my deepest gratitude. After what I am sure are many head-shakes and tests of patience, his feedback has been invaluable and made my dissertation much better. My dissertation committee members, Dr. Caree Banton and Dr. Calvin White, have challenged me in meetings and classes to think better about my topic in different ways and also have heaps of my gratitude. I am a very lucky man and I would like to say in no uncertain terms that mistakes in the following project are entirely my own and are despite the work of my committee. Also an invaluable source of support and encouragement for keeping me sane through this project was Jama Grove, whose insights were inspired, Scott Small, Dan Elkin, and many others who are too many to list here.

I am very indebted to those have helped me find invaluable sources including Robin Roggio and the entire Interlibrary Loan team at the University of Arkansas Libraries. Furthermore, wonderful archivists at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania and the Library Company of Philadelphia in Philadelphia, Senator John Heinz History Center in Pittsburgh, and the Maryland Historical Society in Baltimore have all helped a lost historian find his way.

I could not have done this research without financial support from the History Department and African and African American Studies Department at the University of Arkansas, to whom I will always be indebted. The Diane B. Blair Center of Southern Politics also provided a fellowship that allowed study in archives in Maryland, which helped to construct that part of my study. Finally, the Arkansas Chapter of the Mayflower Descendants provided support, both financial and moral, for this project.

Dedication

To my parents, Tony and Cindy Conley, without whom none of this would have been possible. For my grandfather, Jim Tinkle, who would have been proud.

Table of Contents

Tables

Introduction

Middle Appalachia, the westernmost portion of Maryland and the counties of Pennsylvania where the Appalachian Mountains taper off into foothills, were borderlands developed from the early eighteenth century through the mid-nineteenth century. It was a borderlands in three distinct ways: first, it was an imperial borderland, particularly as it came to the rivalry between Britain and France. Second, it was a cultural borderland, first between Euro-American settlers and Indians, but also between North and South in the nineteenth century. Third, it was an economic and labor borderland, as the expansion of capitalism and the different forms of labor, both free and unfree, along with racial ideas of labor, were evidenced in how it operated.

While different types of borderlands existed in this region, the idea of a borderland has a common definition. Put simply, a borderland is a contested boundary which can exist between empires, as the case between Britain and France, or describes a region undergoing economic changes and transformation, particularly with the expansion of capitalism in Middle Appalachia. Borderlands is useful because of its flexibility and that the definition encompasses the many changes occurring in Middle Appalachia from 1700 to 1850.[1]

Borderlands, and the borders that are interposed across them, also are complex cultural, political, social, and economic phenomenon. In the case of Middle Appalachia, this is most evidently expressed first by the border between French and British territory, and later by slavery's border between Maryland and Pennsylvania. Residents north of the Mason-Dixon Line understood themselves as living in a free state, but in actuality they were not. Unfree labor still

[1] Jeremy Adelman and Stephen Aron, "From Borderlands to Borders: Empires, Nation-States, and the Peoples in Between in North America History" *American Historical Review (*June 1999), 816.

existed as a viable economic and social tool by residents in the North. Those in the southern portions of Middle Appalachia relied far more on slavery but viewed their northern neighbors with suspicion because the Mason-Dixon Line was viewed as a threat to their economic viability.[2]

Middle Appalachia was a borderland between Britain and France and this shaped the early history of the region, even before settlement occurred by Euro-Americans. Europeans and Indians interacted in this region, trading, conducting diplomacy, and forming alliances. Moreover, colonial leaders worked to ensure peace was maintained as expansion occurred, ensuring that Indians would maintain strength in diplomatic circles throughout the eighteenth century. By necessity, this region was also an area of conflict as much as compromise and negotiations. Already contested by various Indian tribes, Euro-Americans also contested the region, ensuring that they would be consistently called upon by their Indian allies and call upon their Indian allies for assistance in wars. This long Indian war, the conflicts that broke out between the British and their Indian allies against the French and their Indian allies, intimately affected how Middle Appalachia developed.

This region, particularly in the last half of the eighteenth century, once settlement occurred in the southern areas of Middle Appalachia, became an economic and labor borderland. European modes of production and labor organization, including forms of free and unfree labor, arrived with the settlers. By studying Middle Appalachia there is opportunity to see not only how the economy developed and transformed but also to see how labor relations were created,

[2] Thomas M. Wilson and Hastings Donnan, "Nation, state and identity at international borders" in *Border Identities: Nation and State at International Frontiers* ed. Thomas M. Wilson and Hastings Donnan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

negotiated, and understood by the residents in the region. Moreover, it will also give insight into how both race and class intersected, especially for the poorest residents of the region.

The nature of unfree labor and the formation of capitalist market connections in the national borderlands is central to this study. To do this, I examine the settlement and development of middle Appalachia, a region situated in western Maryland and Pennsylvania, which underwent settlement beginning in the late colonial period. While the national borderland was created in 1780 with the passage of the gradual emancipation act in Pennsylvania, the borderland status was not new to the white residents of the region. Prior to the Revolution, middle Appalachia was an imperial borderland between France and Britain, and a colonial borderland between Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Maryland, who all claimed this region and the more western Ohio River Valley.

The Maryland and Pennsylvania border was the site of conflict, both physical and political, between the North and South throughout early national and antebellum America. "Frontier Capitalism and Unfree Labor in Middle Appalachia" will examine the western portion of this border, a region that showed prolific economic and demographic growth from the beginning of gradual emancipation through the 1840s. The region, however, remained a contested space between freedom and unfreedom as unfree labor existed well into the antebellum period in southwest Pennsylvania and in Maryland, even though slavery stagnated in the state as a whole, it grew in the western region in absolute terms.[3]

Moreover, "Frontier Capitalism and Unfree Labor in Middle Appalachia" will also emphasize the economic changes which occurred in this region and the effect it had on the

[3] Census records for Allegany and Washington County, Maryland, show that slavery grew consistently in western Maryland throughout the early national and antebellum period.

border between slavery and freedom. Recent historiography has termed this the "rise of capitalism" but it can more accurately be called an expansion of capitalism. Historians have argued persuasively that capitalism existed well before the nineteenth century in America, a contention I concur with. The economic changes, at the individual, local, state, and national levels affected the social nature of this region; ensuring the continued expansion of slavery and unfree labor, ensuring continued demographic expansion producing agricultural and industrial goods, and the transformation of this region not just as a series of economic centers in the Appalachian mountains but also an area of trans-Appalachian migration west into the newly opened lands of the Ohio River Valley.

First, I argue that this interstate region shows how the twin processes of sectionalism and integration into a broader capitalist system changed social, labor, and political relations not only in this region but nationally. By looking at how the politically created Mason-Dixon Line impacted the economics of slavery and capitalism in this region, I make a connection between the eastern and western borders between slavery and freedom, which extended from the east coast to the Ohio River Valley. Second, unfree labor was critical to the development of society and economy in middle Appalachia. Recent historiography has shown that unfree labor (of which slavery is most visible form) existed throughout the North past 1800. This continuation of unfreedom was integral to the development of the western regions of Maryland and Pennsylvania. It existed long past when Pennsylvania set slavery on the path to extinction. Slavery, however, did not dominate this region as it did others in the South. Of course, it always remained a society with slaves, yet it provides an excellent opportunity to see how slavery and other unfree labor forms helped to develop the western economy of those states and to show that

the border between slavery and freedom was more porous than solid.[4] Finally, I argue that this region is an important study for how capitalism and the market economy developed in the United States. Due to late settlement by Euro-Americans (and their slaves), this region began developing rapidly only after the American Revolution. The relatively late settlement by whites and their slaves offers an opportunity to see social and economic construction.

For studies that emphasize the nature of labor, understanding freedom and unfreedom, particularly in the North, is critically important. Particularly after 1804, when New Jersey passed the final gradual emancipation law, the North increasingly identified as a free labor region while still harboring pockets of unfree labor and social controls that mimicked unfree labor. Middle Appalachia exemplifies the slow death of slavery and unfree labor especially as it existed in the borderland between slavery and freedom.[5]

As Ira Berlin reminds us, slavery differed by place and time. Middle Appalachia was no different as it underwent settlement relatively late in the colonial period. Unlike in the Southeast or Old Northwest, however, middle Appalachia did not automatically take on aspects of a slave society or society with slaves, important concepts in understanding slavery in the United States.[6]

---

[4] Here I am using Ira Berlin's definition of a slave society and society with slaves. He defines a slave society as one that is dependent on slavery as the primary mode of labor. A society with slaves is defined as one that relies on slavery as one of many forms of labor and economic production. The western regions of Maryland and Pennsylvania are accurately defined as a society with slaves. Ira Berlin, *Generations of Captivity: A History of African American Slaves* (New York: Belknap Press, 2004), 8-9.

[5] For studies of free and unfree labor in the border north, see Max Grivno, *Gleanings of Freedom: Free and Slave Labor along the Mason-Dixon Line, 1790-1860* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2011), Gary Nash and Jean Soderlun, *Freedom by Degrees: Emancipation in Pennsylvania and its Aftermath* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991); Wilma Dunaway, *The First American Frontier: The Transition to Capitalism in Southern Appalachia, 1700-1860* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996); James J. Gigantino, *The Ragged Road to Abolition: Slavery and Freedom in New Jersey, 1775-1865* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2015); Seth Rockman, *Scraping By: Wage Labor, Slavery, and Survival in Early Baltimore* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 2009); Joanne Pope Melish, *Disowning Slavery: Gradual Emancipation and "Race" in New England, 1780-1860* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University, 1998); and R. Eugene Harper, *The Transformation of Western Pennsylvania, 1770-1800* (Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh University Press, 1991).

[6] Ira Berlin, *Generations of Captivity*, 8-9.

Instead, as whites moved into middle Appalachia, they brought slaves to both Maryland and Pennsylvania, ignoring the ostensible border established in 1780. Just as importantly, middle Appalachia explores how the "contest between master and slave…proceeded on uneven terrain." This contest and the ability of slaves to show agency even in periods when the slaves' power was "reduced to a mere trifle" will be central to my study of slavery in this region.[7]

This study is situated in Berlin's "revolutionary" and "migration" generations. The revolutionary generation, in which slavery underwent serious destabilization in the North due to the military conflict and agency of African Americans, is key to understanding the development of the borderland between slavery and freedom. The destabilization and actions of African Americans to undermine slavery, along with aid from white abolitionists and the economic conditions, ensured the Pennsylvania gradual emancipation law. Importantly, however, Berlin, like other recent historians, argues that the "demise of slavery in the North would be a slow, tortuous process," one very much in play in Pennsylvania.[8]

Slaves freed by these laws or by their owners without legal requirement faced their own problems as it weakened the place of black men and women in the northern economy, particularly in urban areas, where many migrated after freedom. African Americans moved away from artisan work and toward the merchant household, moving away from a more lucrative trade. They found places in the middle ranks of American society, however, by breaking into professions and service trades and this economic independence provided the basis of family

[7] Berlin, *Generations of Captivity*, 3.

[8] Ibid., 103-105.

security, and, as Berlin shows, no goal stood higher for blacks than establishing a household of their own.[9]

Life transformed for blacks, both free and enslaved, in the Chesapeake during the revolutionary generation also. Many slaves gained their liberty in the Upper South for two reasons: first, they were emancipated under relatively loose laws that responded to the Revolutionary sentiment sweeping the United States at the time; second, the changing economy of the region lessened the need for large slaveholding. These newly freed people began to form new life and social institutions. At the same time, new forms of racialization counterbalanced this new freedom; planters and other slaveowners, despite talk of eventual emancipation, became ever more committed to slavery. Maryland and Virginia present apt case studies for these changes, as a transition to a more diversified economy took place. Tobacco monoculture ended and was replaced with mixed farming, primarily foodstuffs. This transition threw slave life into disarray, as families and communities were torn apart by sales south and west. This is important because some of the slaves that were removed from the east moved into western Maryland and beyond, and also because slavery continued to exist even in regions where there was no predominant crop, like tobacco or cotton.[10]

The declension of slavery in the North is a contested narrative that many historians have discussed and debated. I contribute to this debate by studying western Pennsylvania, contextualizing the end of slavery in this region and showing the context in which slavery declined by looking at the North. A series of studies have examined gradual abolition in the North, ranging from New England to the mid-Atlantic showing that as slavery died, new systems

[9] Ibid., 109.

[10] Berlin, *Generations of Captivity,* 113-114; Eva Sheppard Wolf, *Race and Liberty in the New Nation,* 35-37.

of control and labor replaced it and that often African Americans were caught in between these two systems; creating a variety of different labor systems that sought to utilize African American labor depending on time and location. The transition in Middle Appalachia, due to the borderland nature of the region, ensures that African Americans would fall into a system devised and maintained by two states and adapted by local forces.

Joanne Pope Melish's study of New England presents a new interpretation of the end of slavery by showing that, with the end of slavery, whites transferred the language and practices of slavery to newly freed blacks. She argues that the language of antislavery and of republicanism were mutually reinforcing, in that they were ideologies for exclusion for blacks in the region. Moreover, whites felt little need or obligation to change the prevailing paternalistic attitudes towards blacks after gradual emancipation, ensuring that their old assumptions about slaves as needing guidance and control transferred to free blacks.[11] This reinterpretation of slavery and how blacks were treated after independence in New England show that whites wanted to forget blacks and the institution of slavery, creating what would become a "white man's republic" in the antebellum period.

This view of slavery and freedom in New England will have particular importance for my research, as the development of the "white man's country" is endemic across the north during the period after the "end" of slavery. Historian Michael B. McCoy shows that Melish's model of "amnesia about slavery and emancipation" existed outside of New England, specifically in Cumberland County, Pennsylvania. In this county, slavery became stronger as labor demands grew along with the economy. Slavery did not end, however, it just began to appear in a different form that was endorsed by the courts and created "an unending chain of limited

[11] Melish, *Disowning Slavery*, 50, 88, 107.

servitude." Notably, as James Gigantino shows in his study of New Jersey, this process works only in areas where slavery does not linger. Since New Jerseyans "never left slavery behind either in practice or in how it influenced their ideological identity," regions where slavery persisted allowed for the structures of economy and race to remain.[12]

Slavery's continuation under the guise of legal unending servitude is significant, yet the dimensions by which emancipation and continued servitude was an economic decision is important as well. Gary Nash and Jean Soderlund argue that manumission of slaves relied not on ideological fervor or commitment to the ideals of the Revolution, but on economic circumstances.[13] This continues an argument put forward by Fogel and Engerman, who saw that freedom for slaves could only come if the cost of freedom was moderate to whites (that they did not lose out financially on freeing slaves) and this could get "philanthropy at bargain prices." Likewise, Gigantino's study on slavery in New Jersey illustrates the slow retreat of slavery in that state where unfree forms of labor stretched deep into the antebellum period.[14]

Like economic shifts in the North, the social and economic changes of the Upper South, specifically the Chesapeake, are critical to understanding capitalism's development and the fate of slavery in this region. Recent trends in the historiography argues against the traditional view of slavery dying because of agricultural changes in Maryland. Richard S. Dunn has argued that in the Chesapeake, black life developed differently in Maryland and Virginia, with a trend

---

[12] McCoy, 143, 149, 156; James J. Gigantino, *The Ragged Road to Abolition: Slavery and Freedom in New Jersey, 1775-1865* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2015), 9.

[13] Nash and Soderlund, *Freedom by Degrees*, 61-71.

[14] Robert William Fogel and Stanley L. Engerman, "Philanthropy at Bargain Prices: Notes on the Economics of Gradual Emancipation" in *The Journal of Legal Studies* 3, no. 2 (June 1974), 401. Part of this dissertation will also investigate the nature of economic changes in this region, including the integration into the broader capitalist system throughout this period; thus, the economic motivation for freedom and forced servitude will be examined in that broader context.

toward slavery in Virginia and toward freedom in Maryland. An important exception to this will help shape my study: while coastal slaveowners tended to manumit their slaves in Maryland, those in the interior did not.[15] Indeed, as census records show, while slavery stagnated in the state as whole, western Maryland showed continued growth after 1790 due to the need for labor in the region in both agricultural and non-agricultural pursuits.

The social and economic changes occurring in Maryland and the broader Chesapeake, especially manumission, the nature of freedom, and black life, are especially instructive when examined in Virginia. Eva Sheppard Wolf studied early national Virginia and shows that Virginians debated about ending slavery after the Revolution in that state but that nothing was done for fear of the number of free blacks this would produce, the fear of control, and how poor whites would respond economically and socially to emancipation. During this forty year period, emancipation by owners was used to strengthen the institution of slavery, using the promise of freedom to extract labor and obedience from their slaves.

Maryland specifically has been the site of many important studies of slavery. Importantly, it is central to a historiographic debate over whether slavery was dying in the state or not due to agricultural production changes. Barbara Jeanne Fields offered the first major interpretation by arguing that two Marylands existed simultaneously, one white and one black, and this challenged the political, moral, and ideological norms that was supposed to represent a slave society. Baltimore was unique in the state because its rise did not depend on slavery and

[15] Richard S. Dunn, "Black Life in the Chesapeake, 1776-1810" in Ira Berlin and Ronald Hoffman, eds., *Slavery and Freedom in the Age of the American Revolution* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1986), 75.

the nature of labor in the city, which was season, could not support slavery. Thus, Fields argues that slave and free labor were oppositional in nature. [16]

Recent studies have argued against the oppositional thesis, one by studying the city of Baltimore and the other northern Maryland, specifically the Maryland side of the border between Maryland and Pennsylvania. Seth Rockman agrees with Fields on the precarious position Baltimore held in Maryland, in that it had slavery but did not rely on it (in much the same way that Gigantino describes New Jersey). Baltimore's economy relied on grain-related industry, particularly the flour industry, and it was thus seasonal in nature. One of the most important features of the city's economy was the mixed-race job sites, in which he argues that "wage labor, legal servitude, and slavery functioned simultaneously…[and] gave employers an array of choices that overwhelmed an individual man's strategies for finding and keeping work."[17] Indeed, as the antebellum period progressed, Baltimore became more committed to both free and slave labor to meet the demands of the city.[18]

The differences outlined by Fields and Rockman are explored along the Maryland border with Pennsylvania by Max Grivno. He looks at the workforce of that region and agrees with Rockman that they were "patchwork affairs" whose "varied backgrounds and legal statuses defied or at least muddied the neat distinctions between slavery and freedom."[19] Grivno also continues the trend of looking at how free and slave labor fit together, albeit in a rough way. Moreover, Grivno agrees with Wolf's assessment that delayed manumission was a measure of

[16] Barbara Jeanne Fields, *Slavery and Freedon in the Middle Ground: Maryland during the Nineteenth Century* (New Haven, CC: Yale University Press, 1985), xi, 17, 41-42.

[17] Rockman, *Scraping By*, 47.

[18] Ibid., 232.

[19] Max Grivno, *Gleanings of Freedom*, 26.

their determination to maintain slavery while also "a recognition that their authority was eroding."[20]

The borderland between slavery and freedom extended from the east coast through the Midwest. While in the east it was an artificial boundary, as Grivno shows in his study of Pennsylvania and Maryland, in the west it was a physical boundary. Matthew Salafia studies the Ohio River Valley as a borderland between slavery and freedom. This region has both striking similarities and differences from the Mason-Dixon Line. First, and perhaps most important, is that the people who inhabited the region viewed it as a borderland. It was also a firm border, unlike that in the east, in that the river showed a distinct boundary between freedom and slavery. However, much like other regions, particularly those that existed in borderlands, racial boundaries were put in place early and were generally held throughout the antebellum period.[21]

Salafia disagrees with Grivno's assessment on the northern Maryland border, hee argues that in the Ohio River Valley, slavery and freedom were not interchangeable categories for blacks. Indeed, Ohio, Indiana, and Kentucky developed different labor systems and ways to control blacks. Labor is one central element of the borderland between freedom and slavery, but as Stanley Harrold shows in his study of the long borderland, violence is also a component.[22] Middle Appalachia follows Harrold's model of a borderland, as conflict, both real and political, occurred along the border between Maryland and Pennsylvania.[23]

---

[20] Ibid., 92, 116.

[21] Matthew Salafia, *Slavery's Borderland: Freedom and Bondage along the Ohio River* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013), 3, 6.

[22] Stanley Harrold, *Border War: Fighting over Slavery before the Civil War* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2010), xii.

[23] For this assessment, I am relying on Leonard L. Richards, *The Slave Power: The Free North and Southern Domination, 1780-1860* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2000); Stanley Harrold, *Border War*; David L. Lightner, *Slavery and the Commerce Power: How the Struggle against the Interstate Slave Trade led to*

Undergirding the discussion of labor and the nature of the borderland is that of the expansion of capitalism and capitalist market relations. Understanding the capitalist aspects of middle Appalachian development informs the development of social classes and the development of the economy including integration into the national economy. This study will contribute to understandings of capitalism in early America by looking at the human construction of the formal economy and relating that to social constructions.

Wilma Dunaway's study of capitalist development in southern Appalachia is important for this study for two reasons: first, her study details the ways in which southern Appalachia was incorporated into a "world-systems paradigm" to study transitional capitalism; second, middle Appalachia falls outside of this incorporation, particularly when it comes the peripheral nature of the Appalachian argument which is the center of Dunaway's study. While outside actors certainly invested and had expectations of utilizing middle Appalachian resources, middle Appalachians developed the capitalist market connections that were critical to the development of the region after the Revolution. Importantly, however, Dunaway's study presents five historical developments were present in post-Revolutionary middle Appalachia: first, there was a new European demand for agricultural products; second, there was rapid population growth among the new settlers; third, political systems developed by the states and settlers became increasingly responsive to capitalist interests; fourth, the increased mobility of capital affected through new banking and investment opportunities in the region; and finally, technological and transportation opportunities.[24]

Civil War (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2006); and David G. Smith, *On the Edge of Freedom: The Fugitive Slave Issue in South Central Pennsylvania, 1820-1870* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2013).

[24] Dunaway, *The First American Frontier,* 5-6.

Another model of capitalism that is useful for understanding capitalist relations is Sven Beckert's conceptualization of cotton and capitalism. He argues that capitalism from its inception was global in nature and that there was a proto-capitalist state that he refers to as "war capitalism." As its' name suggest, war capitalism was built on violence and paradoxes, such as the reliance on both free and slave labor. Furthermore, the capitalists who drove this expansion separated themselves from nation-states which led to their rise in building global connections. As such, capitalism and the expansion of capitalism transcends national boundaries and instead focuses on the broader networks, identities, and processes that the process encompasses.[25]

Violence was critical to the development of capitalism, particularly when it came to the free-unfree labor continuum. Two studies highlight the nature of violence, particularly as it deals with slavery, both in the Americas and in the United States. The "second slavery" was distinguished by new commodities, produced in unprecedented quantities, in regions formerly marginal to the Atlantic economy, and in reconfigured polities. As Kaye argues, the second slavery in the south requires historians to bridge the divide between the early republican and antebellum period. This is something that this study will do by looking at the time period for this region.[26] While this region was not a slave society as defined by Berlin, slaves were an integral part of the economy.[27] This is most obvious for Maryland, where slave populations continued to rise throughout the antebellum period. For the Pennsylvania side, unfree labor was still critical

[25] Beckert, *Empire of Cotton: A Global History* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2015), xix-xxi.

[26] Kaye, "Modernity in the Nineteenth-Century South and the Atlantic World," *The Journal of Southern History* 75, no. 3 (August 2009), 627-28.

[27] Berlin, *Generations of Captivity*, 9. Berlin defines two types of society: a society with slaves and a slave society.

to the development of the region.[28] Thus, the notion of a "second slavery" will help inform the study of slavery and slaves on both sides of the border.

It was during the development of the "second slavery," particularly after the introduction of cotton, that the violence integral to slavery becomes apparent. Baptist's study of slavery, capitalism, and cotton in the south argues for a different view of capitalist development there. He argues that capitalism developed not only on the backs of slaves (which is not a new argument) but also due to violence and the control of black bodies. This view of capitalist development in the cotton era is predicated on increased production created by violence, although he does admit that technological and administrative advances did occur.[29] This view of slavery will also help bring further understanding to the region I will study by showing how violence and control of black bodies is critical to the development of capitalism (not unlike Beckert's description of war capitalism).

"Frontier Capitalism and Unfree Labor in Middle Appalachia" is divided into five chapters, each chronologically detailing the development of middle Appalachia. Chapter 1 covers the colonial period and addresses the early settlement of the region and the struggle for authority of both Britain and France and the colonies that claimed portions of middle Appalachia. If the struggle of authority is necessarily part of the colonial period, so is the complexity of the people moving into the region. Without loyalties to any particular colony, the white settlers of the region gave their support to whichever colony exerted authority at any one

[28] For the development of western Pennsylvania and the uses of slaves and unfree labor I will be looking at Christopher M. Osborne, "Invisible Hands: Slaves, Bound Laborers, and the Development of Western Pennsylvania, 1780-1820," *Pennslyvania History: A Journal of Mid-Atlantic Studies* 72, no. 1 (Winter 2005), pp. 77-99; R. Eugene Harper, *The Transformation of Western Pennsylvania, 1770-1800*; Edward M. Burns, "Slavery in Western Pennsylvania," *Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine* 8, no. 2 (October 1925): 206-7.

[29] Edward E. Baptist, *The Half has Never Been Told: Slavery and the Making of American Capitalism* (New York: Basic Books, 2014) explores the ways in which slaveowners used "torture" to extract more labor from their slaves.

time. Conversely, those that did have consistent loyalties were slaveholders, who tended to believe all of middle Appalachia was part of Virginia; even the region surrounding Pittsburgh.

Chapter 2 and 3 deal with the Revolutionary period in middle Appalachia. From the end of the French and Indian War in 1763 and the implementation of the federal constitution in 1787. These chapters explore the foundation period of middle Appalachia by looking at participation in the Revolution by different actors in the region, both Euro-American and Indian, and how loyalties were divided between the royal and American cause. They also explore how the region incorporated different and important labor forms for development, particularly an increasingly large influx of slaves that helped the local develop in the 1780s and 1790s, once the region had stabilized from the long Indian war of the previous half century. Moreover, Chapter 3 details the ways in which patriotism and war production combined to helped create industry, infrastructure, and economic development in middle Appalachia, funded by the state (in part) at the insistence of the locals. It also explores the ways in which connections to eastern and western outlets for the goods produced in the region are growing and how society on the frontier developed. Just as importantly, these chapters examine the role slavery and antislavery played in the region and how residents reacted (or did not react) to the formation of the Mason-Dixon Line as a border between slavery and freedom.

Chapter 4 examines the turbulent 1790s in middle Appalachia at the same time that the foundations of nineteenth century development occurred. The region was site of the Whiskey Rebellion in 1794, giving insight into social and political development. Already active in state and national politics, particularly during constitutional development, middle Appalachians consistently were effected and affected national politics during the 1790s. Important economic actors, and even the middle class, also had an investment in unfree labor, which continued to

grow throughout the decade throughout middle Appalachia, regardless of the border between Maryland and Pennsylvania.

The fifth and final chapter deals with the increasingly complex society and economy of middle Appalachia during the nineteenth century. Middle Appalachia underwent integration into both the national economy along with slavery and antislavery structures at the national level. Middle Appalachia was of particular importance for the issue of slavery as it served as a crossroads of the Underground Railroad. Moreover, residents in middle Appalachia consistently participated in national issues including fugitive slaves (middle Appalachians often confronted their state governments over the issue) and national political issues (when it came to employing both labor and finding markets for their goods).

The epilogue contextualizes the struggle of the borderland within an understanding of the national borderlands that did so much to agitate national politics prior to the Civil War. Using the *Prigg v. Pennsylvania* (1842) case, the epilogue explores that way in which individuals, states, and the national government attempted and failed to deal successfully with the fugitive slave issue and the issue of slavery as a whole.

Chapter 1

The Long Indian War: Conflict, Borderlands, and Settlement in Western Maryland and Pennsylvania, 1700-1780

This chapter describes the Indians who claimed this land, how relations with the Indians were formed by both Maryland and Pennsylvania, and how the settlers interacted with their neighbors before and during the Revolutionary period, finally talking about both the historiography and history of slavery during that period. Most importantly, three distinct features of Middle Appalachia appear in this chapter: first, that freedom and unfreedom are hazy concepts in early America, and while racial attitudes may harden throughout the eighteenth century and class attitudes were transferred from Europe to America, freedom and unfreedom in this region remained fluid. Second, the development of this region is an excellent study in the development of capitalism not just by tracing settlement, but also by looking at economic developments that had various stimuli. In short, settlement and the expansion of capitalism go hand-in-hand, just as capitalism and slavery do. Finally, this region operated as a borderland and most importantly, at the end, how it developed into a borderland of freedom and unfreedom.

Middle Appalachia served as an important imperial and cultural borderland between 1700 and 1740 because settlers moved into the Appalachian Mountains throughout the early eighteenth century, creating new zones of conflict and interaction that both replaced and overlaid already existing economic, political, and labor systems. Native Americans were pushed west by increasing settlement in eastern Pennsylvania and Maryland met with tribes who escaped the turmoil which already existed in the Ohio Valley region due to conflict caused by displacement, disease, and trade in the *pays d'en haut*. The systems established by this intermixing of tribes would have a large effect on where, how, and when Euroamerican settlers came into the region.

The Ohio River Valley region, which encompasses the middle region of the Appalachian Mountains, is called the *pays d'en haut*, or the upper country of French Canada. Richard White refers to this region as the "middle ground," a region created from a process of mutual invention by both the French and Native Americans. The middle ground grew due to the lack of ability for either the French or various Indian tribes to completely dominate the region, instead having to rely upon each other to achieve specific ends and create an order that functioned well despite conflicts and violence that erupted there. Sami Lakomäki likewise calls this region a "shatter zone" where slave-raiding and diseases killed thousands of Indians as European explorers, and then colonial powers, penetrated the area, forcing Indians away or to join together to form "coalescent societies." These coalescent societies were created out of new kinship ties, collective symbols and rituals, and identities. Not only did this involve the Shawnee, who would come to dominate western Pennsylvania and Maryland, but also other Algonquian speakers, such as the Lenape (Delaware), Chickasaws, Choctaws, Cherokees, and others.[1]

The displacement and diaspora of Indian tribes throughout central and eastern North America did not change the fact that two major Indian tribes controlled western Pennsylvania and Maryland (along with western portions of other colonies): the Shawnee and the Iroquois. The Shawnee moved into the region in the context of three major developments which involved all peoples, Indian and Euroamericans: the shatter zone in the Ohio River Valley region, the incorporation of the native trade into the Atlantic economy, and their own social structures. The Shawnee migrated into the region from their traditional territories in the Ohio River Valley for three reasons: first, warfare and trade, which were rooted in the political economy of the shatter

[1] Richard White, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 50-51; Sami Lakomäki, *Gathering Together: The Shawnee People through Diaspora and Nationhood, 1600-1870* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2014), 7.

zone; second, their need to create a survival strategy in light of the conflict of the shatter zone by creating new communities and kinship ties; and third, the maintenance of their traditional interconnections and town identities despite the dramatic changes of the shatter zone.[2]

Between 1670 and 1710, bands of Shawnee migrated east into Pennsylvania and Maryland, bringing with them their traditional interconnections but also creating new ones with the Indians who remained in the east despite colonial expansion. They settled throughout the mid-Atlantic from Pennsylvania through Virginia and created alliances with their neighbors which were woven of political, social and spiritual threads and would often work with those neighbors in negotiating with colonial Maryland and Pennsylvania authorities. They also moved into a land in which land, resources, and alliances were competed over by more-powerful groups, whether colonial or native.[3]

The Iroquois, a more powerful preexisting group, settled around Lake Ontario and along the St. Lawrence Valley to the east, or the Susquehanna River Valley to the west. An especially formidable people whose raiding parties extended south into Virginia and the Carolinas, they established a Great League of Peace, which not only kept infighting among the Iroquois to a minimum, but allowed them to exercise influence over other native groups and even the peoples, like the French and British, who would later colonize the region around them.[4]

The Iroquois, much like their Algonquin neighbors, also practiced "mourning wars," fought to reclaim losses from war and disease and throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries escalated to encompass much of eastern North America. These brutal wars escalated in

[2] Lakomäki, *Gathering Together*, 27.

[3] Ibid., 28, 30-31, 34-36.

[4] Alan Taylor, *American Colonies: The Settling of North America* (New York: Penguin Books, 2002), 93, 102, 104.

the seventeenth century due to the introduction of the Dutch trade along the Hudson River, allowing the Iroquois access to new weapons in turn for Dutch access to furs. Moreover, the Iroquois sought new hunting lands and extended their raids far outside their home territories. The combination of the Iroquois desire for beaver furs, hunting lands, and captives to replace their dead or atone for deaths by torture created an "engine of destruction" that broke up the tribes and groups of the east.[5]

The destruction unleashed by the Iroquois throughout the seventeenth century created a "middle ground," which was a process of creation involving both the French (who settled in Canada and Louisiana and spread their influence throughout the central regions of North America) and the various native tribes that moved into the region and became integrated into the broader system. The middle ground system grew out of the inability of both sides to gain their ends through force, instead they were forced to gain the cooperation or consent of foreigners. Commerce on the middle ground, and indeed throughout the North American colonial experience was not a peaceful process as violence was also an option "so prevalent in the early trade because common on the nature of the exchange itself developed only gradually."[6]

Understanding the fluidity of the middle ground as it concerns identity, commerce, and diplomacy is important in understanding the nature of labor of native groups on the periphery of French and English colonization throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In French Canada around the Great Lakes region and in English America, especially in the southeast centering on the Carolinas, unfree labor was an integral cultural and economic force. Native

[5] Ibid., 102-105; Richard White, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815*, 1.

[6] White, *The Middle Ground*, 52, 75.

slavery's predominance illustrates that unfree labor existed before the penetration and settlement of whites in these western regions and that much like in European colonial society, it was integral in cultural, diplomatic, and economic development.

Between 1660 and1760, French colonists and their native allies enslaved thousands of Indians throughout North America, extending into the North American southwest, where slavery was also common, and east into the middle Appalachian region. The extent of the slave trading, both east and west of the *pays d'en haut*, also shows how far integration occurred into the Atlantic world economy and gives perspective on the expansion of capitalism in America. Native slaves taken and sold in French Canada would often not only be sent to towns and villages in New France but also to the French Caribbean. Despite this, indigenous slavery in French America was not driven by a high demand for slaves among French colonists, either in North America or in the West Indies but rather by political and cultural imperatives with slaves acting as guarantees of peace.[7]

Slavery in native society and French Canada often had the characteristics of the charter generation of slavery in the English colonies, especially the fluidity and ambiguity of the status of slave in society. For many slaves transferred between native groups, through either trade or, more commonly, warfare, their status was malleable, with the ability (especially for women and children) to incorporate into the societies in which they enter as slaves. This fluidity of slavery was a trademark of most indigenous forms of slavery, although connected as it was to European society, the status of those slaves would change. Brought into an Atlantic system predicated on

[7] Brett Rushforth, *Bonds of Alliance: Indigenous and Atlantic Slaveries in New France* (Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 2012), 10-11, 29.

the need for slave labor to produce staples, these native slaves would trigger debates about the efficacy of their use as plantation laborers both in French and English colonization.[8]

The incorporation of indigenous slavery was critical to English colonization, both in New England and in the lower south, especially South Carolina. These colonies, with Massachusetts and South Carolina leading the way in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, integrated slavery into the structures of their society and economy, with a reliance on native slaves. In New England, the identity of the colonists, moreover, was created in reaction to the existence of native slaves, and more broadly, of Native Americans. This same identity would be expanded throughout the mid-Atlantic in the mid-eighteenth century as Indian warfare began to spread throughout the region.

This discussion of indigenous slave labor shows that unfree labor was universal in both native society and in the new colonial societies being formed on the peripheries of the North American continent. Moreover, it shows that unfree labor forms were critical to the expansion and development of these colonies- a fact that will remain true after independence and well into the nineteenth century. The native groups that existed in the middle Appalachian region are not just important for understanding unfree labor, but also, ultimately, why and how European powers viewed the region as a prime territory for expansion.

The period from 1689 until 1763 was a period of "unbroken Anglo-French rivalry" in both Europe and North America. Indians would be critical to the North American theater, as, ultimately, European colonial empires in North America relied upon the alliances and cooperation of Indian tribes. Wilma Dunaway argues that, as a semiperiphery of the world economy, colonial English/British America was actually integral to these contests. At the same

[8] Ibid., 182, 355-56.

time that this struggle was occurring, capitalism was expanding in North America, creating new conflicts both between Indians and Europeans and inter-European struggles.[9]

Maryland and Pennsylvania, despite the differences in their economies, share many similarities, especially as both remained proprietary colonies throughout the colonial period. Both colonies likewise received an enormous influx of Germans in the eighteenth century that changed the complexion of the colonies both before and after independence, and while Maryland's economy relied much more extensively upon slave labor than did Pennsylvania's, the two economies grew in tandem, especially as Maryland transformed into a grain producing region in the western portions of the state, with Baltimore becoming the central processing city on the eve of the Revolution. Both Maryland and Pennsylvania had a diversified economy, depending on agriculture, manufacturing, extractive industry and commerce. Just as importantly, from their founding both colonies relied upon unfree labor to varying degrees, a reliance that would continue after independence and into the nineteenth century.[10]

Socially, Maryland and Pennsylvania had a different complexion but for many of the same reasons: both colonies were created as religious havens, Pennsylvania for Quakers and Maryland for Catholics, both religious groups became minorities relatively quickly in their provinces. Both colonies attracted Germans, and actively did so, particularly the Penns. The primary difference is that Maryland relied much more heavily on African slavery. Following the model of Virginia, for much of its' early history, it was a tobacco producing colony which

---

[9] Wilma A. Dunaway, *The First American Frontier: Transition to Capitalism in Southern Appalachia, 1700-1860* (Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996), 11.

[10] For the importance of unfree labor, see Sharon V. Salinger, *"To serve well and faithfully": Labor and Indentured Servants in Pennsylvania, 1682-1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987); Robert Owen Heavner, *Economic Aspects of Indentured Servitude in Colonial Pennsylvania* (New York: Arno Press, 1978); Ira Berlin, *Generations of Captivity*; Brugger, Robert J. *Maryland, A Middle Temperament: 1634–1980* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1996).

developed plantation agriculture, slavery as a primary mode of production, and a culture based upon that system.[11]

Maryland was first settled in 1634, after Cecilius Calvert, the Second Lord Baltimore, received the grant his father was promised and promoted Maryland as a haven for English Catholics, persecuted in England. He viewed Maryland as his personal demesne, a latter day feudal estate from which he could benefit. Unfortunately, Calvert's plan for a Catholic haven did not work out, as they quickly became the minority and lost political, social, and economic positions in Maryland society in the religious and social upheavals of the late seventeenth century. Much like in Virginia, tobacco quickly became the crop of choice and the demand for labor required the importation of African slaves. The eastern region of Maryland developed first and it maintained economic, social, and political preeminence in the colony long past the time in which they were economically, socially, and politically preeminent.[12]

Slaves were present from nearly the beginning of the settlement of Maryland. Seventeenth century slavery is referred to as the "charter generation" of slavery by Ira Berlin, and the characteristics of this "generation" include the presence of Atlantic creoles, whose linguistic skills and understanding of the Atlantic's diverse commercial and cultural practices let them move between African and European culture successfully. Many of the early societies in North America were what Berlin refers to as "societies with slaves," or societies whose economies did not depend upon slavery. The combination of these allowed for more agency among the enslaved population. In the Chesapeake, slaves were allowed much more latitude in

[11] Aubrey C. Land, *Colonial Maryland: A History* (Millwood, NY: KTO Press, 1981), 27-28.

[12] William Hande Browne, *Maryland: The History of a Palatinate* (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1912), 22-23; James McSherry, *History of Maryland; From its First Settlement in 1634, to the Year 1848* (Baltimore: John Murphy, 1848), 22-23; Bernard Bailyn, *The Barbarous Years: The Conflict of Civilizations, 1600-1675* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2012), 119-120.

their daily lives than would be present in future generations, particularly when it came to their economic output. Indeed, by the end of the seventeenth century, both Maryland and Virginia were compelled by planters to legislate against the slaves' economy. This is not to say, however, that slavery was less of a burden upon those enslaved; on the contrary, slaves were restricted from the introduction of slaves into the colonies and those restrictions only grew as the colonial period progressed. In the late-seventeenth and early-eighteenth centuries, Virginia and Maryland were at the forefront of developing legal definitions of slavery, limiting the avenues of freedom that those enslaved could follow while at the same time relying upon black slaves in ever greater numbers. These two trends were intertwined and by the early eighteenth century, legal slavery was well entrenched in both colonies.[13]

While Maryland, for much of its early history, followed the Chesapeake model of development which included plantations, staple crops, and slaves, in the eighteenth century it deviated from that model for a variety of reasons. However, to understand those reasons, it is important to look at the settlement and development of Pennsylvania, particularly the large influx of Germans in the mid-eighteenth century. William Penn's designs for Pennsylvania, which he billed as a refuge for English Quakers but became, through cheap land, extensive advertising, and promises of religious freedoms, what people then and since have called "the best poor man's country." The colonization of Pennsylvania was rapid, with populations rising dramatically from

[13] Ira Berlin, *Many Thousands Gone: The First Two Centuries of Slavery in North America* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000), 17-22, 29-35. For a full exploration of the development of slavery, servitude, and the impetus for these developments see Edmund S. Morgan, *American Slavery, American Freedom: The Ordeal of Colonial Virginia* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1975). For the impact of gender and slavery, see Kathleen M. Brown, *Good Wives, Nasty Wenches, and Anxious Patriarchs: Gender, Race, and Power in Colonial Virginia* (Charlotte, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996). For contextualization of slavery in the Chesapeake within the Atlantic and global system, see David Brion Davis, *Inhuman Bondage: The Rise and Fall of Slavery in the New World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006) and Davis, "Looking at Slavery from Broader Perspectives" *The American Historical Review*, vol. 105, no. 2 (Apr. 2000), p. 452-466.

first settlement in 1684 and continuing throughout the eighteenth century. Moreover, Pennsylvania attracted not only large numbers of British colonists, primarily Quakers in the beginning and later non-Quakers from all over the British Isles, it also attracted many immigrants from the European continent. Foremost among them were the Germans, who became the largest non-English migratory group in the eighteenth century. The German immigrants not only changed the complexion of Pennsylvania, but as they moved further inland and southward, Maryland and other southern colonies also.[14]

Germans arriving in Pennsylvania generally settled on the western periphery of the colony, beginning around the well-settled region surrounding Philadelphia and, along with large numbers of Scotch-Irish, moving west. This put them into conflict with the Native Americans of the region, forcing continual negotiations and settlements between Pennsylvania and the Indians while also causing divisions between the Pennsylvania government in Philadelphia and these western settlers . The introduction of these settlers caused three interrelated, yet distinct, developments in both Maryland and Pennsylvania. First, they generally established small farmsteads and townships in what is now central Pennsylvania and Maryland; second, they caused issue with the regional Indian tribes as they required more land and became central to colonial-Indian relations; and third, they became firmly invested in not only expanding the frontier but also in integrating into the expanding capitalist system of the eighteenth century colonies.[15]

---

[14] Arthur D. Graeff, M. Kollmorgen, et. al., *The Pennsylvania Germans*. ed. Ralph Wood (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1942), 3-7. Alan Taylor, *American Colonies: The Settling of North America*, (New York: Penguin Books, 2002), 320-323.

[15] Aaron Spencer Fogleman, *Hopeful Journeys: German Immigration, Settlement, and Political Culture in Colonial America, 1717-1775* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1996), 69-93; Land, *Colonial Maryland*, 171-173.

Moreover, they also left their mark on the development of western Pennsylvania and Maryland in another significant way. While Pennsylvania never relied upon slavery in anywhere near the magnitude of Maryland or the more southerly colonies, it was a critical component of the economy. By the mid-eighteenth century, some six thousand slaves worked in Pennsylvania compared to nearly one hundred thousand in Maryland by 1790.[16] The small number of slaves in Pennsylvania belies the importance of slavery in that colony and also does not take into account the number of other unfree laborers, particularly indentured servants, which also worked in the state. A large number of these white, unfree laborers were of English and German origins and were critical to both economic development and westward expansion of the colony and those institutions also migrated with them to the south, into Maryland, Virginia, and the further southern colonies.

The early history of Pennsylvania shows how important slavery was for Pennsylvania. In both Philadelphia and the surrounding agricultural sectors, there was widespread use of slave labor. Slaves were engaged in agricultural, commercial, and industrial pursuits. While slavery looked much different than in surrounding colonies in Pennsylvania, with rights such as property ownership, trial in courts, and the ability to remain in the colony after freedom, Pennsylvania passed a set of black codes that "formalized a caste system on the basis of skin shade and…restrictions on free blacks."[17] Slaves were not the only form of unfree labor utilized in early Pennsylvania, however, as indentured servitude played an important role in the development of not only Philadelphia but the surrounding areas also.

---

[16] Gary B. Nash and Jean R. Soderlund, *Freedom by Degrees: Emancipation in Pennsylvania and Its Aftermath* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 4. This was in 1765 at the end of the highest period of slave importation in the colonial period.

[17] Ibid., 12.

Indentured servants worked primarily in rural areas, although by the 1720s, they were utilized in Philadelphia also. Indentured servitude allowed for people to come to Pennsylvania that otherwise would not be allowed to and their labor in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century was critical to development. There are two different stages of indentured servitude in Pennsylvania. The first was primarily European immigrants who came from the British Isles and mainland Europe. The second group were created after 1780, as the children of slaves were transferred into the system of indentured servitude.[18]

The number and use of unfree laborers in Pennsylvania largely depended upon the state of colonial and imperial diplomatic relations. For most of the eighteenth century, indentured servitude was strongest in periods of economic boom times that coincided with imperial peace. During wartime, however, indentured servitude weakened in the colonies as the British military enticed away servants and it was during war that slave imports increased. The late eighteenth century, with the French and Indian War and then the Revolutionary War, saw the decline of white indentured servitude for political, economic, and ideological reasons, while experiencing the rise of black indentured servitude.[19]

Just as significantly, settlement of western Maryland in the 1730s and 1740s began to change the nature of Maryland. Germans arrived in large numbers, migrating mostly from Pennsylvania, although some did come directly to Maryland. This movement was no accident, the regions of western Maryland and Pennsylvania were a colonial borderland, not just between competing imperial powers but also between the colonies. The colonial administrations of both

[18] Sharon V. Salinger, *"To serve well and faithfully": Labor and Indentured Servants in Pennsylvania, 1682-1800* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 3.

[19] Ibid., 47-81.

Maryland and Pennsylvania urged these German settlers to move into the disputed land between Maryland and Pennsylvania, which deepened the conflict between the two colonies. They urged them, separately, to help solidify their control over the region.[20] 1732 was the year in which western Maryland began to be settled in earnest. As settlers, primarily German but including other ethnicities, began moving down the Monocacy Road, which led from Pennsylvania south into Maryland, Virginia, and the more southerly colonies, Lord Baltimore sought to entice settlers by granting a new headright in Maryland. This headright included 200 acres and a guarantee of property, geared towards attracting Pennsylvania Germans and other settlers to develop the region.[21] From 1732 to 1760, increasing number of residents settled in the region, ensuring that land speculators were well-rewarded and also previewed the development of the western economy of Maryland. As one historian explains it: "They were the best customers for real-estate dealers could imagine- practiced farmers [and] hungry for land…" Moreover, the cash poor residents were forced to rent, rather than buy outright, their lands. This trend of landownership, in which absentee landowners owned a significant amount of land in western Maryland (and this would be true of Pennsylvania when the region was settled) was slowed by the headright system and by the abatement of quitrents in Maryland, allowing for more landownership. However, by the late eighteenth century, land companies and large land owners who bought up large tracts of land were able to dominate agricultural development. This, in large part, mimics how development occurred in middle Appalachia in the eighteenth and nineteenth century. Outside landowners and capitalists developed the region, exploiting the natural

[20] Dieter Cunz, *The Maryland Germans: A History* (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1948), 49.

[21] Ibid., 58-59.

resources and labor of the inhabitants, while the region itself did not receive the profits as investment.[22]

The settlement of western Maryland was predicated on the increasing numbers of immigrants, especially Germans, to the region and an increasing integration of the colony in the Atlantic economy. The profitability of the western farmers, who primarily grew grain, relied on new markets and governmental intervention to ensure they had access to those markets. Critically, the changing labor relations of the region, including both free and unfree labor, relied upon government sponsored construction of a capitalist system of economic relations that bloomed in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Frederick County was created in 1748 because of the large influx of was already integrated into the colonial and Atlantic economy. In May 1739, settlers in the Monacacy River Valley petitioned the colonial legislature for a road to be constructed to Annapolis, the colonial capital, so as to have access to markets for their grains and other produce. In 1749, another road was to be laid out giving Fredericks Town access to both inland and eastern markets. Indeed, between 1739 and 1779 roads were ordered constructed that linked the western regions of Maryland to both the east and north to connect with the growing Pennsylvania towns.[23]

During the late seventeenth century, there were calls to diversify the Maryland economy, something possible because New England ships, bound for the West Indies, stopped in the Chesapeake for grain to trade for rum, sugar, and slaves in the Caribbean. The inclusion of Maryland in the Atlantic economy's provisioning trade also stimulated town growth in those

---

[22] Cunz, *The Maryland Germans*, 70; Wilma A. Dunaway, *The First American Frontier: Transition to Capitalism in Southern Appalachia, 1700-1860*, 52-53.

[23] J. Thomas Scharf, *History of Western Maryland: Being a History of Frederick, Montgomery, Carroll, Washington, Allegany, and Garrett Counties from the Earliest Period to the Present Day, Volume 1* (Philadelphia: Louis H. Everts, 1882), 436-37.

regions that emphasized the western regions that produced grain, livestock, and wheat. Maryland attempted in 1747 to stimulate town growth by requiring tobacco inspections points throughout the colony, unfortunately the nature of the tobacco economy ensured that they would be seasonal affairs after harvest rather than year around. The growth of the grain economy, however, helped to do what colonial authorities were unable. The wheat, corn, and livestock economy brought year-round economic activity, not only agricultural in nature, but also ensured a steady stream of work for artisans, teamsters, and, just as importantly, wage laborers. Moreover, it triggered industrial development in the western portion of states, including leatherworking, flour milling, and small-scale mining and crafting operations. The latter half of the eighteenth would see a setback during the French and Indian War but would be stimulated by the Revolution and after independence.[24] During the eighteenth century, there were fewer unfree laborers in western Maryland than in the nineteenth century. Most of those that came into the region were white indentured servants, although even they were few. Slavery, while very important to eastern Maryland, developed slowly but consistently in western Maryland.[25]

Historians have debated the nature and usefulness of unfree labor, particularly in Maryland, in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century. While historians traditionally have argued that free and slave labor were oppositional in nature, middle Appalachia does not support this thesis. Instead, it shows that free and slave labor were "patchwork affairs," in Max Grivno's thesis, whose "varied backgrounds and legal statuses defied or at least muddied the neat distinctions between slavery and freedom."[26] In urban areas, like Baltimore, "wage labor, legal

[24] Robert J. Brugger, *Maryland, A Middle Temperament*, 63-65.

[25] John F. Kvach, "Wheat, Wealth, and Western Maryland: The Growth and Evolution of Flower Milling in Frederick County, Maryland, 1748-1789" (Master's Thesis, West Virginia University, 2002), 20.

[26] Barbara Fields, in *Slavery and Freedom in the Middle Ground*, for instance that two Maryland's existed simultaneously, one white and one black, and this challenged the political, moral, and ideological pillars that was

servitude, and slavery functioned simultaneously… [and] gave employers an array of choices that overwhelmed an individual man's strategies for finding and keeping work."[27] Indeed, as the antebellum period progressed, Baltimore became more committed to both free and slave labor.[28] The debate over the reliance on slavery in non-staple agricultural production does not take into account, however, the importance of slavery in town economy and non-agricultural production. Future chapters will address this further, but it is too limited of a view of slavery to suggest that it's importance is limited to the agricultural sector alone.

The regional economy and labor both fit within larger socioeconomic norms of colonial North America. Most prevalent, particularly in the early eighteenth century, were several developments that gave unique characteristics to regional slavery. The formation of race, discussed earlier, was most prevalent. The social distance between whites and blacks became even more firm in the eighteenth century as even those whites who were smallholders or landless clung to the idea that they were white. Moreover, slaves faced increasing demands on their time in the Chesapeake, as slaves worked more days and longer hours to produce the same amount of crops.[29] The transformation which occurred in the Chesapeake is what Ira Berlin calls the "plantation generation," in which racial attitudes hardened, plantation system of agriculture became dominant, and African and African American slaves began to develop their own communities and identities separate from white society around them. Middle Appalachia

supposed to represent a slave society. Baltimore was unique because its rise did not rely on slavery and the nature of labor in the city, which was seasonal, could not support slavery. This led south Marylanders, whose economy was still dominated by tobacco and relied heavily on slavery, to continually retrain the political power of the city. Thus, Fields argues that slave and free labor were oppositional in nature. Max Grivno, *Gleanings of Freedom*, 26.

[27] Seth Rockman, *Scraping By*, 47.

[28] Ibid., 232.

[29] Ira Berlin, *Generations of Captivity*, 59, 61.

developed along these lines. Slaves never comprised a majority of the population but unfree labor, both in terms of whites and blacks but most importantly black slaves, ensured that it would be critical to the local economy. Western Maryland developed differently than eastern Maryland, with its large plantation and slaveholders. In western Pennsylvania, unfree labor remained present well into the nineteenth century, something that happened only in pockets in the state and only slowly declined in the nineteenth century.[30]

Farmers in early America were very active in the marketplace when they were able. The reasons for limited marketplace activity among colonial farmers had more to do with scarcity of labor more than a scarcity of desire to be in the marketplace. In more developed areas, like eastern Pennsylvania and Maryland, hired laborers were both common and used frequently, particularly by large landowners. However, in less well-developed areas, particularly on the edge of colonial development, this was rarer although hired free and unfree labor was still employed.[31] The importance of market integration and the desire for land to enter those markets altered the settlement of western Pennsylvania.

Western Pennsylvania has not entered into the equation yet because that part of the region was not settled by whites until the mid-eighteenth century. The settlement of western Pennsylvania, and that of the westernmost reaches of Maryland, took much longer to settle since geography worked against the settlers who migrated to this region. The valleys through which

---

[30] Ancestry.com. *1790 United States Federal Census* [database on-line]. Provo, UT, USA: Ancestry.com Operations, Inc., 2010. Images reproduced by FamilySearch.

[31] John J. McCusker and Russell R. Menard, *The Economy of British America, 1607-1789* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: The University of North Carolina Press, 1991), 297. For the debates over the nature of agricultural labor, farmers and markets in early America, see Christopher Clark, *The Roots of Rural Capitalism: Western Massachusetts, 1780-1860* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1990); Wilma A. Dunaway, *The First American Frontier: The Transition to Capitalism in Southern Appalachia, 1700-1860*; Max Grivno, *Gleanings of Freedom: Free and Slave Labor along the Mason-Dixon Line, 1790-1860*.

settlers passed go north-south, allowing easier passage from Pennsylvania through Maryland and into Virginia. Settlement did not begin in southwestern Pennsylvania until the early 1750s and by this period, colonial disputes over control of land, along with imperial disputes over control of the region, seriously disrupted settlement. Further settlement would not occur until the 1780s, after the Indian threat had been removed and the government of the United States had concluded treaties with Spain. In addition, there were a series of Indian wars and raids over nearly forty years that devastated and slowed settlement of the region. These Indian attacks did not reach farther south into Maryland but that colony became a crossroads in efforts to fight off both French attacks, during the French and Indian War, and British attacks, during the American Revolution. The retarded settlement of western Pennsylvania had important effects on the social and economic development of this region as a whole. [32]

Southwestern Pennsylvania, including the region surrounding the future city of Pittsburgh, was a region of military and political contention between both Britain and France and also between Pennsylvania and Virginia. As settlement continued into the mountainous regions of Maryland and Pennsylvania, conflict with the Indians in the region was impossible to avoid. The Indian threat was constantly in the mind of settlers in western Maryland and Pennsylvania, particularly with the onset of the French and Indian War. Western Maryland and Pennsylvania played crucial roles in the war which consumed the backcountry of most of the colonies as the French and their Indian allies fought primarily for control of the Ohio River Valley. While this war spread broadly across North America and the Atlantic world, this region was a crossroads for military actions early in the war. Fort Cumberland, in western Maryland, was constructed as

[32] Tim H. Blessing, "The Upper Juniata Valley," in *Beyond Philadelphia: The American Revolution in the Pennsylvania Hinterland* ed. John B. Frantz and William Pencak (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1998), 156-157.

a launching point for the invasion of western Pennsylvania to attack Fort Duquesne, which later became Fort Pitt. Both Fort Cumberland and Fort Pitt would later turn into important regional entrepots for settlement, commerce, and social development.[33]

The valleys through which settlers passed go north-south, allowing easier passage from Pennsylvania through Maryland and into Virginia. The Juniata River Valley underwent settlement prior to the Revolution and grew despite continued Indian attacks throughout the 1760s and 1770s. Beyond the Juniata River Valley, settlers were encouraged by the Ohio Company, formed by wealthy Virginians in the 1750s, to settle in the Monongahela River Valley and a tributary, the Youghiogheny River Valley. In 1753 and 1754, the first settlers arrived and a small settlement, including a company storehouse, was built on the Red Stone Creek. It would be this path, forged by the Ohio Company, which would become the road by which military expeditions against the French would occur, along with continued settlement south from Virginia.[34]

The French and Indian War began with a dispute over control of the Ohio River Valley, with George Washington's attempt to take Fort Duquesne in 1754 at the orders of Governor Robert Dinwiddie of Virginia. In 1753, Washington took a small contingent of men with a letter from Dinwiddie with orders that the French who were building forts in the region to desist and remove themselves. The French refused, and Washington was ordered to write a report and have it presented to various members of the Virginia government. Dinwiddie was convinced by this report that there was a crisis brewing in the Ohio River Valley and ordered now-Lieutenant

---

[33] Brugger, *Maryland*, 94-95; Fred Anderson, *Crucible of War: The Seven Years' War and the Fate of Empire in British North America, 1754-1766* (New York: Vintage Books, 2001), 325-29.

[34] Daniel P. Barr, *"A Colony Sprung from Hell": Pittsburgh and the Struggle for Authority on the Western Pennsylvania Frontier, 1744-1794* (Kent, OH: The Kent State University Press, 2014), 40.

Colonel Washington to take a two-hundred man force of Virginia militia and remove the French from the valley.[35] This expedition ended in disaster, with Washington forced into surrender at Fort Necessity, compelling intervention by the British military.[36]

General Edward Braddock arrived in Virginia in 1755, followed by two regiments of British soldiers. Braddock planned to march north, confront the French and defeat them, which the colonial militia seemed unable to do. Taking the same path as Washington the previous year, he marched through western Maryland, stopping and meeting with militia units from Maryland, Virginia and North Carolina at Fort Cumberland, which was positioned on the Maryland bank of the Potomac River. From there, Braddock marched north to again attempt to seize Fort Duquesne, where he too met with disaster. What remained of his command after a short but bloody battle along the Monongahela River, which claimed Braddock's life, marched back south.[37]

The experiences of those who settled in middle Appalachia prior to and during the French and Indian War are illuminated by the story of Jane Frazier and her husband, John Frazier. Jane was born in 1735 near Winchester, Virginia and John, a "Scotchman" who first attempted to settle in western Pennsylvania but was unsuccessful due to the imperial contest there, moved near Winchester sometime before 1754. The Fraziers were married in 1754 and relocated to a creek near Fort Cumberland, Maryland and established a homestead. An Indian attack killed a hired laborer that the Fraziers employed and the kidnapping of Jane. She lived with the Indians in western Pennsylvania for thirteen months before escaping with the help of two "Dutchmen"

[35] Fred Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 44-45.

[36] Ibid., 54-55.

[37] Ibid., 94, 107.

from Pennsylvania who were also captured and adopted by a tribe. She returned to her homestead near Cumberland to find that her husband had remarried. Fortunately for Jane, that illegal marriage was dissolved and they reunited, bore three children, and "dug us a farm out of the wilderness and built us a good house."[38]

John Frazier, who established a gunsmith and large residence, near the Indian village Venango had to flee once French incursions began. Venango, northwest of Pittsburgh, was part of the contested ground between the French and British. He fled south, to Virginia, where he met his wife, Jane, before moving to Maryland. Both his and Jane's story show that the backcountry of Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia were borderlands of settlement, movement, and Indian conflict.[39]

If western Maryland served as a fortified crossroads for British military expeditions during the French and Indian War, western Pennsylvania served as a battleground and a crossroads. The southwestern portion of Pennsylvania underwent Euro-American settlement slowly. Settlement began before 1750 but records are few for this period. In 1750, however, the colonial government forced settlers out of the valley to ensure peace with the Native American tribes who claimed this region. Pennsylvania is notable both for the lengthy peace it maintained with the Native American tribes but also for the violence of the warfare when that peace broke down.[40]

---

[38] James W. Thomas and T. J. C Williams, *History of Allegany County, Maryland* (Baltimore: Regional Publishing Company, 1923), 84-87.

[39] Ibid., 87-88.

[40] Tim H. Blessing, "The Upper Juniata Valley" in *Beyond Philadelphia: The American Revolution in the Pennsylvania Hinterland* ed. John B. Frantz and William Pencak (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1998), 156-157.

This long peace is important for two reasons: first, it ended abruptly and the colonial government was caught off-guard and second, when the peace did end, the brutality of frontier Indian war fell heaviest on the newly settled western portions of the states. As James H. Merrell has shown in his study of the "go-betweens" in Pennsylvania, this "long peace" was maintained by people in both Indian and Euro-American society. Since every colonial project had to overcome European deep-seated fear of the American wilderness and William Penn, who founded Pennsylvania, was on the forefront of these peaceful efforts. He did so by establishing very early on friendly relations with the neighboring Indian tribes, ensuring consistently peaceful relations with them by being in almost constant contact, including ensuring land deals that bought, rather than conquered, Indian territory.[41] In order to ensure the peace between colonists and Indians, stable relationships, including common ideology, interests, and experiences, had to either be found or created between the two groups. From the founding of the colony until the 1750s and 1760s, this maintained peace.[42]

Another aspect to this is the effect this has on the colony of Pennsylvania. When the peace finally broke down between Pennsylvania and neighboring Indian tribes, the conflict was violent and long. It also put an unusual strain on colonial Pennsylvania politics during the 1750s and 1760s. This caused the Quaker domination of Pennsylvania politics began to crack under the pressure, ultimately, collapsing during the Revolution and ensuring a radical turn in Pennsylvania politics during that war. It also allowed for the development of the "anti-Indian sublime." As Peter Silver argues, the anti-Indian sublime was used against the Quakers in power

[41] James H. Merrell, *Into the American Woods: Negotiators on the Pennsylvania Frontier* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1999), 23.

[42] Ibid., 27.

in order to undermine their authority, and in so doing, a new racial language entered political discussions.[43]

Silver argues that "white people" became a group that encompassed not just those typically associated with whiteness, primarily the English, but other groups such as German and Irish settlers on the western frontier. Indeed, this new proto-racialist language used against Native Americans was not created specifically to understand the differences between Euro-Americans and Native Americans, but rather as a political instrument to understand the differences between Indians and Europeans, creating sympathy with western settlers who were suffering due to Indian war in the west, and finally, to provide a standard by which the loyalty of people, particularly those in power, could be measured. This shows that race, at least during this war, was being developed that would later come to define whites a group which included most people of European ancestry. Unlike in more southern colonies, this racism was developed not against the backdrop of African slavery but against Native Americans.[44] Importantly, it would not be until the Indian threat was removed that Native American apologists would rise in Euro-American society and African Americans would become central to understanding of race. As Silver points out, with the removal of the Indian threat, Euro-Americans were no long worried about the violence and retaliation and were able to construct a competing narrative sympathetic to Indians.[45]

Western Pennsylvania, as it was settled by incoming migrants, was an imperial and cultural borderland. Settlers there were forced to negotiate and confront their Indian allies, as a

[43] Peter Silver, *Our Savage Neighbors*, xviii-xx.

[44] Ibid., xxi, xxiv.

[45] Ibid., 294-96.

result the region was in almost constant conflict from the beginnings of settlement through the Revolution. To a lesser extent, this is true of western Maryland, although the settlers there were more insulated from Indian attacks, during the French and Indian War they still fled the region except for the areas immediately surrounding the fortifications constructed there throughout the early eighteenth century, with the construction of Fort Cumberland in the 1750s as the westernmost point of defense.[46]

Settlers in middle Appalachia, while bringing with them preconceived notions of both race and class of their eastern neighbors, show the development of anti-Indian racial attitudes. In 1754, members of the Delaware, Shawnee, Wyandot, and Seneca tribes launched attacks on the settled regions of western Pennsylvania due to an agreement in which the Iroquois sold land to Pennsylvania that belonged to them. This fits into Silver's idea of the development of anti-Indian racism and the creation of the sublime in Pennsylvania. Moreover, this was hastened by the fact that Pennsylvanian authorities attempted, at several different points, to force settlers out of the valleys to avoid this sort of conflict. This ensured that at the same time settlers were developing anti-Indian attitudes, there was also growing distrust of eastern authorities which would be used against the Pennsylvania authorities both during and after the French and Indian War.[47] Anti-Indian racism therefore helped create the framework by which antiblack racism would develop and solidify in the Revolution.

Attitudes about class were transferred from Europe to America at the beginning of colonization. Views of lower class whites were hardened in England before colonization,

[46] Tim H. Blessing, "The Upper Juniata River Valley,"155-156; Barr, *A Colony Sprung from Hell: Pittsburgh and the Struggle for Authority on the Western Pennsylvania Frontier, 1744-1794* (Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 2014), 232-234.

[47] Tim H. Blessing, "The Upper Juniata Valley," 156-157.

outlined by Richard Hakluyt's "Discourse of Western Planting."[48] These views hardened in the colonies during the late seventeenth century and contributed to the impulse to import slaves rather than indentured servants. Throughout the eighteenth century, poor whites were viewed with distrust, particularly those in rural areas, by elites who considered poverty and unemployment to be the product of a lack of desire for improvement. Indeed, many of the early colonial tracts argued for using the new American colonies as a dumping ground for the "embarrassing lower-class populations" or "waste people".[49] They were deemed lazy and dissolute, ensuring that they would be targeted with laws that were designed to ensure that they continued working. While no plans for enslaving whites came to fruition, they were proposed in England and ideas of this had occurred in the colonies. The primary reason for this not happening is because of the development of racial attitudes, with whiteness being associated with freedom and blackness with slavery.[50]

This attitude was taken by those who observed the settlement of western Pennsylvania. As small settlement and isolated farmstead developed in middle Appalachia, investors, observers, and government officials called them "vagabonds" and understood that they were breaking the law, but also that there was no way to stop them. Indeed, these intrusions by settlers and the seeming lack of response from colonial or imperial authorities created further tensions with the Indians of the region, who demanded the British army force settlers back into the east.[51]

---

[48] Nancy Isenberg, *White Trash: The 400-Year Untold History of Class in America* (New York: Random House, 2016), 22-24.

[49] Ibid., 5.

[50] Ibid., 63; Morgan, *American Slavery, American Freedom*, 321; Dunaway, *The First American Frontier*, 112-13; Dunaway, *Slavery in the American Mountain South* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 22-25.

[51] Barr, *A Colony Sprung from Hell*, 99.

As middle Appalachia developed, the political, economic, and social constructs developed in the early colonial period would be transferred and adapted to the region. Moreover, as slavery became more prominent, either the term slaves that served in Pennsylvania or the slaves of western Maryland, it ensured that residents of the region continued to have the conversation about slavery despite their desire for a white man's country and the ideology needed to support that. In this regard, then, the French and Indian War had a profound impact upon Middle Appalachia for three reasons: first, the development of the region was setback by continued conflict with the neighboring Indian tribes, a conflict that would continue through the Revolution. Second, as settlement began to grow, especially in the late 1770s and 1780s, social and racial stratification occurred as more unfree laborers began to enter the region. Finally, this ensured that the region would remain dependent upon unfree labor for decades to come.

The end of the French and Indian War did not mean the end of conflict, as the issues raised by the British victory in that war led to further conflict with Indians and to conflict between the colonies and Great Britain. Middle Appalachia, situated as it was on the borderland between French and British power inevitably faced the consequences of these conflicts the most. The Indian conflict continued and in 1763 Pontiac's Rebellion broke out, bringing fresh waves of violence to the northern reaches of Middle Appalachia.

The region conflict between settlers and Indians was so intense stems from two issues: first, the opening of the west to further, unauthorized settlement; and second, that British relations with the Indians now under the broadened territory was unstable at best. In regard to the opening of the west to further expansion, that was an unexpected result of the military campaigns in western Pennsylvania. In 1758, Brigadier General John Forbes was tasked with taking Fort Duquesne. Forbes understood two things about this campaign: first, the importance

of quick travel and supply lines; second, the need for Indian allies. While he was perhaps no better than his military predecessors in dealing with the Indian tribes, he did understand Braddock's mistake in not having Indian allies with him. In response to this, he ordered the construction of a road through the western Pennsylvania wilderness through which his army could pass, including forts which would later serve as settling points for future settlers. The construction of the road eventually led to the destruction of Fort Duquesne and success of the British military in the Ohio River Valley.[52]

The construction of this road and the forts along it allowed for increasing settlement of western Pennsylvania, an issue that increasingly angered the Native Americans tribes throughout British North America. With the conclusion of hostilities in 1763, the demographic and geographic growth of the colonies increased rapidly. Indeed, immigration from Europe tripled in the interwar years and increasingly the settlers moved in all directions over a much wider range than anyone, British authorities or Native Americans, had previously considered.[53] In Pennsylvania, population which had previously been contained largely to the southeastern portion of the state began to explode west, particularly with the newly constructed Fort Pitt a hub of settlement. Some 10,000 families were living in Appalachian Pennsylvania by the 1770s following an increase of population for the colony as a whole of forty percent. Just as importantly, southwestern Pennsylvania operated as a funnel for settlers who moved south following the Great Wagon Road through western Maryland and into the southern backcountry of Virginia, North Carolina, and Georgia.[54]

---

[52] Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 267-273.

[53] Colin G. Calloway, *The Scratch of a Pen: 1763 and the Transformation of North America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 56-57.

[54] Bernard Bailyn, *Voyagers to the West: A Passage in the Peopling of America on the Eve of Revolution* (New York: Random House, 1986), 14-15; Calloway, *The Scratch of a Pen*, 59.

While the growth of settlers proved disconcerting to many Indians on the frontier, the British abandonment of the traditional gift-giving that had been central to their strong relationship with the French exacerbated tensions with the British. Indians expected the British, like their French predecessors, to use traditional gift giving in diplomatic talks. Unfortunately, the British were on the brink of bankruptcy by the end of the French and Indian Wars and had decided to cut back on expensive gift giving in diplomatic negotiations. The British, for their part, viewed an Empire as something to be governed, not cultivated through traditional techniques with Indians. This not only put British officials, soldiers, and settlers in a precarious position on the frontier but in counterpoint, made the surprise of Pontiac's Rebellion even more stinging with the closeness of those settlers and soldiers to the Indians amongst whom they lived.[55]

In response to threats both perceived and real, a confederation of Indians attacked western British fortifications and settlements in an attempt to stymie further settlement and push back the settlers already encroaching on their territory. The Indians attacked in a coordinated effort which surprised British forces. While initially on the defense, British forces and leaders were able to use a combination of diplomacy and effective tactics to end the rebellion. The effect of this rebellion was important, however, as it allowed for two developments: first, it changed British policy towards the Indians, ensuring that they would get in line much more with the previous French policy while at the same time attempting to stop further western settlement. The Proclamation of 1763 was the result of this rebellion and it would be a catalyst for

[55] Calloway, *The Scratch of a Pen*, 67-69, 71.

revolutionary impulses among Virginians but the same is not true of Pennsylvanians who eyed land in middle Appalachia.[56]

The Proclamation Line was not intended to stop western expansion, and it did not stop or even slow settlement west of the Appalachians, but rather to regulate it in an imperial framework. Unlike in Virginia, where the regulations interrupted the acquisitive plans of the major investors in companies like the Ohio Company, in Pennsylvania it was seen as an opportunity for investors. Plans for investment continued in Pennsylvania because the Penn family and Assembly were no longer middlemen for western land acquisition. Instead, speculators and investors could go directly to the British government. Growth in the northern parts of middle Appalachia was stunted as those settlers in western Pennsylvania faced repeated attacks by Indians but resettlement resumed immediately in western Maryland. The Marylanders, protected as they were by forts and continuing presence of colonial militia, continued to develop the region. While there are no statistics or records for population in the region, there is evidence that shows that the economy of western Maryland began to grow again after the conflict of the 1750s and 1760s and that slaves were present. [57]

Pontiac's Rebellion stunted but did not stop settlement in middle Appalachia. At the conclusion of the rebellion, settlement resumed. In western Pennsylvania, it was especially evident in the hinterland around Pittsburgh. The Marylanders, protected as they were by forts and continuing presence of colonial militia, continued to develop the region. Neither the Proclamation Line, while stymying efforts of some and providing opportunities for others, nor

[56] Ibid., 67-76; 92-94.

[57] Daniel P. Barr, *A Colony Sprung from Hell*, 110-112; Woody Holton, *Forced Founders: Indians, Debtors, Slaves and the Making of the Revolution in Virginia* (Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 1999), 28-29.

the land companies and land speculators slowed the settlement of this region. The settlement was only slowed by Indian resistance and lack of eastern support.[58]

Importantly, in both regions the military presence of British regulars and colonial militia had effects on settlement. In western Pennsylvania, the region around Fort Pitt was settled slowly but steadily, but because of the Proclamation Line, they did not settle in the immediate vicinity of Fort Pitt for fear that the British military would eject them (as the military most likely would have given the opportunity). In western Maryland, especially around Fort Cumberland, which would late develop into the town of Cumberland, Allegany County, Maryland, settlers sought the protection of the military forces that were stationed there. This shows similarities and differences in how different settlements occurred. Both forts were supplied by the surrounding settlers, but the settlers opinions of the forces in the respective areas were different as they were either trying to make money from supplying troops in close proximity or trying to make money supplying the troops with knowledge that the troops could be ordered to expel them. Either way, the presence of military forces in middle Appalachia stimulated settlement, especially agriculture.[59]

The imperial crisis of the 1760s and early 1770s showed that strains in colonial Maryland and Pennsylvania, both in terms of the nature of their governments, which were proprietary, and in their society. The Penns of Pennsylvania faced increasing scrutiny and resistance after the French and Indian War, driven in part by those westerners who bore the brunt of Indian attacks and those in the east who sought but were denied political power. In Maryland, the proprietors

[58] Barr, *"A Colony Sprung from Hell",* 120-122.

[59] Barr, *"A Colony Sprung from Hell"*, 102-103; Thomas, James W. and T. J. C. Williams, *History of Allegany County, Maryland* (Baltimore: Regional Publishing Company, 1969), 95-96.

faced stiff resistance during the war as they tried to rally colonial resources for the war effort and after the war as they tried to reinforce the rights given in the charter. Both proprietors also supported the parliamentary attempts for taxing the colonists to help pay for the massive war debts after the French and Indian War.[60]

The Maryland government and voting rights were established in the early eighteenth century, when the Calvert family lost the colonial charter and Maryland became a royal colony. This early political system caused friction between westerners and easterners and between urban and rural populations during and after the Seven Years' War. The Assembly, in 1715, passed election laws that remained in force until the Revolution. It required property qualifications to vote, either fifty acres of land or forty pounds sterling of "visible estate." Moreover, compulsory attendance at elections for those who qualified was in the law, though not strictly enforced. Finally, all those qualified to vote were required to vote in the county courthouse, which posed a problem, especially for those in western Maryland.[61] Aliens, Catholics, and the propertyless were not allowed to vote, ensuring that the colonial government, and those who voted in colonial elections, were invested in maintaining the status quo. By emphasizing ethnicity and class, the law ensured those in the eastern portions of the state would be a dominant voice in Maryland politics and that, furthermore, the emerging city of Baltimore and the growing populations of western Maryland would have a limited role in government.[62]

Importantly, this also ensured that Maryland and the proprietor would be unable to cope with the changing economic, political, and social circumstances of the colony, allowing for

[60] Land, *Colonial Maryland*, 237-245; Silver, *Our Savage Neighbors*, 96-97.

[61] David Curtis Skaggs, *Roots of Maryland Democracy*, 18.

[62] Ibid., 20.

unrest to grow in the diverse populations, especially those that settled most in western Maryland. The end of the colonial period, then, showed a sharp division between ambitious officeholders and those who supported the proprietor. It also showed divisions between the predominant English-controlled government and the ethnically and economically diverse western portions of the state with high numbers of Germans.[63]

Maryland experienced a boom period after 1750, with the population growing by about 67%, making it the fourth most populous colony in British North America. Frederick County, which was the westernmost county in Maryland, increased by 54%. This caused several political and social problems. For instance, each county was allotted four delegates to the assembly and therefore a loss of political equality, especially for the exploding western counties of the state. This particularly effected the city of Baltimore in the east and Frederick County in the west.[64] There was some debate in the 1760s between the governor of Maryland and Lord Calvert over the creation of the new counties and the governor won by arguing that they did not have the population to support a court system. Not until the Revolutionary government of Maryland created Montgomery and Washington counties, cutting them off of Frederick, that more representation would be given to westerners in the state and two more delegates given to Baltimore.[65]

The French and Indian War exposed the proprietary government to attacks for a variety of reasons, the two most prominent were the lack of western defense by the eastern governments and the desire for more political power by westerners in a political system that was, by the

[63] Ibid., 26.

[64] Ibid., 30-31.

[65] Ibid., 31-33.

1760s, outdated. First, the proprietary family remained firm in collecting dues from the colony, even during the height of the war and at a time that the colony was having trouble legislating money and materiel for the war. The freemen of Frederick sent an address to Charles Carroll of Carollton thanking him for his "spirited, manly, and able opposition to that illegal, arbitrary, and Unconstitutional measure." This shows that westerners in Maryland, much like their northern neighbors, were active in colonial politics throughout the 1760s. They would become more so as the imperial crisis continued.[66] Second, the proprietary government did not oppose the Stamp Act of 1765 although the popular mood was decidedly against the new tax. The Stamp Act crisis proved to be a turning point in colonial politics as the use of mob violence, the transference of political authority to extra-legal organizations, the loss of deference to those in authority and established traditions, and the reorientation of the country party as opposed to both proprietor and Parliament ensured that by the Lower House elections of 1767, allies of the proprietor were defeated.[67]

The urban-rural (west) alliance in Maryland was also present in Pennsylvania in the 1760s. In Pennsylvania, this opposition was spearheaded by an alliance between urban mechanics in Philadelphia and western farmers on the frontier, like those in the Juniata River Valley, who were still frustrated by the lack of defense and erratic land policies of the colonial government. The development of a peculiar, localist sort of politics in western Pennsylvania stems from the lack of support from the eastern government. Despite the quickly growing population and diversity of Pennsylvania, the politics of the state were still in the hands of those

[66] Barker, *The Background of the Revolution in Maryland* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1940), 258-59; Steiner, "Western Maryland in the Revolution," 8.

[67] Barker, *The Background of the Revolution in Maryland*, 116-23.

who qualified to vote. Suffrage qualifications in Pennsylvania were limited to fifty acre freeholders, which meant that about sixty percent of Pennsylvanians who were also white and male could vote. The push for expanded political power occurred during the French and Indian War and caused political schisms that would ensure that the Pennsylvania ruling class would not support American protests during the imperial crisis (either pro- or anti-proprietor factions) but would nonetheless drive the colony into the Revolution. [68]

The coming of the Revolution in Pennsylvania must be understood through the lens of the political infighting of eastern elites, specifically between the pro- and anti-proprietor factions. The Proprietary party, reeling from the political damage of the French and Indian Years War, attempted to cling to power by showing loyalty to the crown, particularly in the Stamp Act Crisis of 1765-6 while the Quaker party, or anti-proprietary party, also tried to show loyalty by not protesting the Stamp Act. By 1766, however, a new political alignment was forming that would include people from the west, especially farmers of various ethnicities, and those of the middling and lower sort in the more settled east. Moreover, this quietness of the ruling class angered many in the west, whose suspicions about the indifference of eastern elites was confirmed.[69]

The electoral power of the Quakers and their supporters in eastern Pennsylvania ensured that there would be east-west friction in Pennsylvanian politics. During the war and the imperial crisis, the ruling Quaker assembly was largely supported by Germans in Pennsylvania, two groups who typically clustered around the eastern population centers, where electoral power

[68] John A. Neuenschwander, *The Middle Colonies and the Coming of the American Revolution* (Port Washington, NY: Kennikat Press, 1973), 18-19.

[69] Robert Middlekauff, *The Glorious Cause: The American Revolution, 1763-1789* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005) 147-49;

[69] Tim H. Blessing, "The Upper Juniata Valley," 156-157.

was.[70] Their opponents campaigned for a royal government, a campaign that would continue until the coming of the Revolution and explains why both factions were silent during the imperial crisis. This is also a major difference between Pennsylvania and Maryland, the push for a revocation of the Maryland charter and the creation of a royal colony never occurred. While it was unsuccessful, and nearly brought down the faction that was pushing for the royal colony in Pennsylvania (including men like Benjamin Franklin), it shows how colonial politics could both reflect the demographics by gaining support by different ethnicities and also how important the westerners in each colony were to the politics of each colony during the imperial crisis.[71]

In both colonies, a political alliance formed between urban and rural populations of the lower class. In Maryland, it was between those in the growing city of Baltimore, whose population skyrocketed after the Revolution, and the westerners who were underrepresented, and sometimes largely disfranchised, in the western portion of the state. In Pennsylvania, it was between urban residents of Philadelphia, particularly those groups locked out of power, and westerners, who were under constant Indian threat. In both cases, during the Revolutionary period, this alliance would ensure a dramatic change in the governance of both colonies, although those changes were distinct to both colonies.

The imperial crisis of the 1760s and 1770s, with the exception of political fights over representation in Maryland and Pennsylvania, largely passed over middle Appalachia. Those people living clustered around the forts or using the roads to travel west were not very much concerned with the major issues facing eastern cities, especially New England. Instead, their concerns were more focused on immediate issues, such as rebuilding and resettling after the

[70] Silver, *Our Savage Neighbors*, 197.

[71] Middlekauff, *The Glorious Revolution*, 148.

French and Indian War and Pontiac's Rebellion, dealing with the local Indians still in the area, and dealing with the conflict between the colonies over control of the region.[72]

The contest between Virginian and Pennsylvanian authorities over middle Appalachia consumed much of the late 1760s and 1770s, particularly after economic considerations forced the abandonment of Fort Pitt in the 1770s by the British. Since Pennsylvania did not send troops to garrison the area, it encouraged Virginia governor Lord Dunmore to attempt to seize the region for Virginia. Dunmore's War impacted the people of the Pennsylvania portion of middle Appalachia because they identified with one colony or the other and both colonies attempted to create jurisdiction over the region.[73]

It was not until 1775 that western Pennsylvanians organized themselves in a Revolutionary fashion. Forming a Committee of Correspondence, the people of Westmoreland County, which encompassed large portions of western Pennsylvania, declared loyalty to the king and condemned the actions of British troops at Lexington and Concord. They phrased their resistance, however, in terms of local issues that involved Indians, lands, and colonial contests for control. The same is true for middle Appalachia generally, with some revolutionary organization occurring but framed in local issues.[74]

Middle Appalachian residents were involved in the shaping of state governments, however. In 1776, at the behest of the Second Continental Congress, Pennsylvania drafted the most liberal constitution in the colonies. It was a democratic constitution, allowing for any white taxpaying male who pledged an oath to the state of Pennsylvania to vote and serve in the

---

[72] Barr, *A Colony Sprung from Hell*, 165-169.

[73] John E. Potter, "The Pennsylvania and Virginia Boundary Controversy" in *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, Vol. 38, No. 4 (1914), 407-426; Barr, *"A Colony Sprung from Hell"*, 156-65.

[74] Barr, *"A Colony Sprung from Hell"*, 176.

government. Moreover, any act of the legislature would have to be approved by the people of the state, so that no law could go into effect without approval of a majority of the voters of Pennsylvania.[75]

The tension surrounding the constitution was especially evident in the Bedford County delegation to the state legislature withdrew, representing broad swaths of, protesting not only disfranchisement under the constitution but also the difficulty in amending it, which they claimed undermined the ability of the people to run their government. After the withdrawal and a reapportionment in 1779, the representation from the region was cut by two-thirds and attendance at assembly meetings by the delegation was irregular. This shows how important local control is, including opposing outside interference in local affairs by state officials who, all things considered, did not serve well western Pennsylvania. Moreover, the residents of this region "seem to have regarded the Pennsylvania government as a distant and rather undependable ally…"[76]

Western Maryland was under less pressure from Indian attacks during the Revolution, indeed, the region's population was growing rapidly enough that in 1776 the Convention, which was the interim government of Maryland, voted to split Frederick County, which encompassed all of western Maryland, into districts. These new districts would later be converted into counties, although they did have to fight with the state assembly to gain county status.[77] This is

[75] Daniel Hackett Fischer, *Washington's Crossing* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 27. "…the Pennsylvania government, which in 1776 was the most radical in the world, [had] a unicameral legislature and more democracy than any other instrument of government."

[76] Blessing, "The Upper Juniata Valley," 159-160.

[77] Steiner, "Western Maryland in the Revolution," in *John Hopkins University Press in Historical and Political Science* Series XX No. 1, edited by J. H. Hollander, J. M. Vincent and W. W. Willoughby (Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1902),18-22.

important because it shows how quickly the southern portion of Middle Appalachia was developing, both in terms of population but just as important, in terms of political power. Moreover, the western portions of Maryland continued to struggle for more political equality into the early national period. This is because Maryland adopted a relatively conservative revolutionary state constitution. Voting was restricted to those who met property, age, and residence requirements, along with being free men. Unlike in Pennsylvania, the Maryland government would have a moderately strong executive, a bicameral legislature, and an independent court system. Unlike in Pennsylvania, the Maryland government would have a moderately strong executive, a bicameral legislature, and an independent court system. Pennsylvania and Maryland were alike, as were most of the new state constitutions, in having a declarations of rights and for shorting the western parts of the state in representation.[78]

Western Maryland played an important role in the Revolution and benefited from the war. While they contributed men to the war effort, industry was also stimulated in the western regions. Fredericksburg, for instance, became an important powder depository, the county was home to nine gun shops, each of which produced twenty guns per month. Moreover, the region was home to saltpeter works, and two working cannon foundries.[79] While specifically ordered constructed there during the war and to defend from Indian and possibly British attack, and it also shows that the necessary resources for the construction of these industries is in western Maryland.

[78] J. Thomas Scharf, *History of Maryland from the Earliest Period to the Present Day, Volume II: The Struggle for Liberty, 1766-1812* (Hatboro, PA: Tradition Press, 1879), 283-85.

[79] Robert J. Brugger, *Maryland: A Middle Temperament*, 124; Steiner, "Western Maryland in the Revolution," 44-46.

Just as important, the government, both local and state, were involved in the development of the arms industry in western Pennsylvania. The Provincial Convention, which was the governing body of Maryland during the Revolution in 1775 and 1776 until the new constitution went into effect, ordered the construction of a gunlock factory in Frederick. The Antietam Iron Works in Washington County, Maryland received men by order of the Council of Safety and was under contract to produce cannon for the war effort. Another important foundry was the Catoctin Iron Furnace, which produced cannon and shell. The Council of Safety relied upon western Maryland to produce military supplies, and both Maryland and Virginia relied upon what was produced there. The government also encourage the construction of linen manufactories and a sheeting mill.[80]

The existence of these industries shows several things about western Maryland. First, that industrial development during the war was dependent upon government grants, both in terms of land and financial support; and second, that there were enough artisans and other forms of labor to support these industrial developments. Moreover, during the war, Frederick County became highly developed, with both a manufactory base and a waypoint for grains and other agricultural products.[81]

This development fits in the pattern that Wilma A. Dunaway explores in her study of southern Appalachia (which expanded into the northern reaches of Middle Appalachia), that towns quickly became hubs of industrial, commercial, agricultural, and social development in southern Appalachia. These towns were not only local hubs of commercial interactions but formed a chain of commercial interactions both inside the region and provided important

[80] Steiner, "Western Maryland in the Revolution," 46-47.

[81] Ibid., 48-49.

linkages to outside markets. It is through these towns that people, goods, and information moved to and from Middle Appalachia. It is also in these towns that social stratification occurs and that slavery became very visible, although in the southern part of Middle Appalachia, slavery was visible everywhere.[82] Because of the infrastructure development during the late colonial and revolutionary period, towns like Fredericktown and Cumberland linked western Maryland to eastern Maryland and also connected towns in western Maryland north, into western Pennsylvania. Cumberland is a great example of this: settled shortly after the Revolutionary War ended, it quickly became trading center, surrounded by farmers, and a resting place for travelers going to the Ohio River country.[83] As towns rose in prominence throughout the newly created counties of western Maryland, they created more linkages, insuring that the expansion of capitalism, which was occurring incrementally during the colonial period, would speed up as infrastructure improved and the region produced more goods.

The northern reaches of Middle Appalachia in western Pennsylvania did not develop like that in western Maryland, as the region faced many more difficulties. While support for the Revolution was strong in Middle Appalachia, western Pennsylvania struggled much more. The defenses that protected most of Pennsylvania from Indian attacks during the war did not protect the westernmost settlements of the state. Moreover, there was conflict between Virginia and Pennsylvania, which both claimed the region surrounding Pittsburgh, with both creating counties in the region and ensuring that conflict between settlers would continue, much like that which occurred between Maryland and Pennsylvania in the mid-eighteenth century. Though the main action of the Revolution occurred in the eastern part of the colonies, with George Washington

[82] Dunaway, *The First American Frontier*, 198.

[83] Thomas and Williams, *History of Allegany County, Maryland*, 95-96.

fighting a war of posts in the middle colonies and Nathaniel Greene a war of maneuvers in the southern colonies, but the Revolution was also fought at the margins.[84] Western Pennsylvania, already ravaged during the French and Indian War, continued to be devastated by Indian attacks during the Revolution. Some areas of western Pennsylvania lost as much as seventy percent of the population and the lack of support of the Pennsylvania government kept complaints alive that the government was unresponsive. Because of this, the Bedford delegation to the state legislature was largely absent during the Revolution. The period from 1779 to 1782 was the period of peak Indian attacks in the region and the destruction and retarded development meant that it would not be until the mid-1780s and 1790s before the northern parts of Middle Appalachia underwent the settlement seen in western Maryland during the mid-eighteenth century. It also insured that the northern regions of Middle Appalachia, all the way to the area surrounding Pittsburgh, would have a unique cultural, social, and political caste than that of the rest of the state, and many of the political battles fought during the late colonial and revolutionary period would be fought again during the early republic period.[85]

The American Revolution had a large impact upon middle Appalachia. By the end of the Revolution, settlement was occurring in earnest throughout the region. New signs of state authority, such as the legal establishment of town, counties, and courts of law were being created. The contest between Virginia and Pennsylvania over the region surrounding Fort Pitt was settled, as were the border difficulties between Maryland and Pennsylvania. Although some regions of western Pennsylvania lost as much as seventy percent of their population due to

[84] Frantz and Pencak, *Beyond Philadelphia*, xxiv.

[85] Ibid., 158-169.

Indian raids and continued complaints about the unresponsiveness of the state government abounded, the region began to develop in the 1780s.[86]

By the mid-1780s, the Indian threat in middle Appalachia was much diminished and previously lightly- or unsettled regions became targets of those seeking lands in the west. Fayette County, Pennsylvania was erected in 1783 and quickly became a target for western settlers. Importantly, the institution of slavery and other forms of unfree labor became critical for development here as it was settled not just by those from eastern Pennsylvania but also by Marylanders and Virginians. While Cumberland began to grow as a town in the 1780s, Allegany County was erected to help govern these western settlers and assert state authority.[87]

Importantly, middle Appalachia did not stop being a borderland. It was no longer a borderland between empires (as the Treaty of Paris of 1783 recognized the western boundary of the United States as the Mississippi River), nor was it still a cultural borderland between Indians and settlers, it still had important characteristics of a borderland and developed into a new type of borderland. The next chapter will detail the development of this region as an economic borderland, as settlers use strategies to develop a local economy that is connected to wider regional and national markets. One of those strategies is the employment of unfree laborers, especially black slaves, in developing agricultural, industrial, and commercial pursuits and middle Appalachia will develop into a borderland of slavery and freedom as Pennsylvania begins a long road to abolishing slavery.

---

[86] Frantz and Pencak, *Beyond Philadelphia*, xxiv, 158-169.

[87] *History of Fayette County, Pennsylvania*, Franklin Ellis, ed. (Philadelphia: L. H. Everts & Co., 1882), 131; Thomas and Williams, *History of Allegany County, Maryland*, 93.

Chapter 2
The Foundations of a Borderland: Antislavery, Slavery, and the Law in Middle Appalachia, 1770-1790

The 1780s was a foundational period for middle Appalachia. A second wave a settlers, who did not experience the long Indian war nor the turmoil of the American Revolution moved into the region. The second wave settlers fit into many categories, often more than one simultaneously, that included investors and speculators, small farmers, veterans who were granted land there by three states (Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia), along with a handful of transients. Importantly, these settlers also brought an influx of unfree laborers, ensuring that unfree labor remained a mainstay of middle Appalachia while also laying the foundations for the capitalist market relations which began in the 1790s.

Middle Appalachia, much like the states and nation as a whole, underwent large transformations after the Revolution. States began to reexamine slavery, race, and labor in ways that affected middle Appalachia. Antislavery sentiment grew, particularly in the North, and continued the destabilization of slavery caused by the Revolution. The revival and growth of the Pennsylvania Abolition Society (PAS) and the passage of the 1780 gradual emancipation law had a profound impact on middle Appalachia, for it created an artificial border that impacted social, economic, and political growth on both sides. The impediment to slaveholding and the use of unfree labor, the identification with free, yeoman labor, and contest that centered on fugitive slaves all began to form in the 1780s.

The growth of unfree labor in the 1780s due to an influx of settlers bringing unfree laborers naturally increased the population of African Americans in the region. With the presence of African Americans, both free and enslaved, issues concerning the supposed freedom

of Pennsylvania began to percolate, especially as kidnapping of free blacks and the arrival of fugitive slaves from the South became more common after the turn of the century.

The formation of this borderland occurred as the region became integrated. Integration occurred in a variety of ways, including crossborder settlement (primarily from Maryland and Virginia into Pennsylvania), the construction of infrastructure, and the travel and trade that developed among the residents. As both this chapter and the next will detail, the states themselves were active in creating this integration as residents saw the competition between Baltimore and Philadelphia for regional dominance over middle Appalachia develop in earnest after the Revolution. This push towards infrastructure improvement and the increased settlement simultaneously pushed forward the integration of this region into a world capitalist marketplace, yet that integration should also be measured in its connection to political and social movements. Integration of middle Appalachia into the antislavery movement occurred in the late 1780s as the PAS expanded westward along with the population. Immediately, the issues of kidnappings and fugitives became important to both state antislavery authorities and to local residents who had to grapple with this new borderland between free soil and slavery.

Thus, by 1790, middle Appalachia was a borderland whose political economy was shifting and the foundations of that shift were constructed in the 1780s. The use of enslaved laborers, the growth of agricultural and industrial output, and the growth of towns all contributed to a region which received interest and investment from outsiders along with attractive lands that brought in a second wave of settlers.

In the mid-1780s, Margaret Hutton, joined by son-in-law, Captain A. Magruder, left Prince George's County, Maryland and settled in middle Appalachia, specifically in Fayette

County, Pennsylvania.[1] Most likely joined by her brother, William Goe, Sr. and his son, William Goe, Jr., they settled into a region that was recovering from the damaging effects of the Revolution and the previous decades of Indian wars.[2] They came to unlock new economic opportunities, bringing with them around 29 slaves, including at least five women to cultivate the new lands they settled. These women gave birth to children throughout the 1780s: Rachel gave birth to a boy and a girl in 1781 and 1783 respectively; Hannah to the same in 1783 and 1786 respectively; Sarah, "a mulatto slave", gave birth to two boys; Susanna to three girls and a boy, and Nogee to a girl and a boy.[3]

The children of these slaves were both lucky and unlucky to be born when they were after the family's move to Pennsylvania. At least in theory, the 1780 gradual emancipation law would eventually provide them with freedom, though their luck ran out as they would not achieve that freedom until their mid- to late-twenties, and even then it was still undetermined what that freedom would look like. Rachel's two children, Benjamin (1781) and Leah (1783), therefore, eventually would go free because they were born into a time and place in which slavery was undermined by both the state and socioeconomic forces. Most important of these forces was growing antislavery activity across Pennsylvania.

The antislavery movement, while picking up momentum in the Revolutionary period, originated in the various enlightenment and religious movements of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century. Morality and religion were oftentimes the heart of the antislavery

[1] The time they settled is a rough estimate based on the septennial censuses taken by Pennsylvania; land purchases registered by Pennsylvania, and slave birth registrations beginning, at the latest, in 1789.

[2] Their point of departure is not completely sure, this is a rough estimate of where the family came from. There are no sure records of Hutton and Magruder, although there are for the Goes in Maryland.

[3] RG-47 Birth Records for the County Governments, Fayette County Prothonotary. Birth Records for Negroes and Mulattoes, 1788-1826 *(PSA)*, # 142-150 and 328-330.

argument; a part of the movement that will remain integral to both antislavery sentiment and of American Protestant Christianity in general.[4] Quakers were some of the earliest to indict slavery upon moral and religious grounds. Beginning with the first antislavery petition from the Germantown Friends in 1688, which outlined an early argument against both slavery and the slave trade, Quakers were active in the antislavery movement. [5]

After the Quakers worked to rid their own meetings of slavery, they began publishing journals and books, petitioning state legislatures, and creating antislavery organizations, all centered on Philadelphia. As historian Manisha Sinha accurately states, "not all Quakers were antislavery, but most abolitionists in the British colonies were Quakers."[6] Moreover, Quakers who opposed slavery incorporated their opposition into broader attacks on warfare and wealth making.[7] The epicenters of antislavery sentiment were multivaried and depended upon the regions of British North America. The enlightenment project of Georgia, which banned slavery early in the colonial period to New England, which saw the first antislavery tract published in Boston called the *Selling of Joseph*, which married religious language to create a biblically inspired attack on the institution of slavery.[8]

In British North American, Puritan thought was used to also support slavery, however. For most denominations and ministers, the concern with slavery primarily revolved around the

[4] Locke, Mary Stoughton, *Anti-Slavery in America from the Introduction of African Slaves to the Prohibition of the Slave Trade, 1619-1808*, 14.

[5] "Germantown Friends' Protest against Slavery, 1688" in *Am I Not a Man and a Brother: The Antislavery Crusade of Revolutionary America*. Edited by Roger Bruns (New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1977), 3-5.

[6] Manisha Sinha, *The Slave's Cause: A History of Abolition* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2017), 12.

[7] Ibid., 13.

[8] Stoughton, *Anti-Slavery in America*, 15; Wendy Warren, *New England Bound: Slavery and Colonization in Early America* (New York: Liveright, 2017), 229.

slave's wellbeing.[9] The reason that Quakers held a stronger antislavery position, therefore, does not stem from their uniqueness in condemning it but the emergence of Quakers as leaders. This was in large part because George Fox, the founder of the Quakers, "laid down the Christian foundation for abolition" by using the Golden Rule.[10] It was not until the 1760s, when interstate Quaker-based organizations developed that antislavery sentiment truly began to make grounds, not only in the community but also in broader American society (in the North especially).

As the Revolutionary crisis deepened, despite the defenses of slavery as critical to the economy of especially the southern colonies, Americans "elaborated their love of liberty and their hatred of slavery", which continued to undermine support of slavery and making the institution much harder to ignore. [11] The spread of antislavery sentiment into broader society was slow but by the 1770s, it had spread both north and south of Pennsylvania and New Jersey. Antislavery measures were actively being debated by the people and legislatures of the Chesapeake and New York; and more action was being taken in New England, where the strongest attacks on slavery were levied during the Revolutionary War. The Revolution itself provided ammunition for the antislavery argument.[12]

The war military conflict also contributed to the destabilization of slavery by breaking "the unity of the planter class and compromising its ability to mobilize the metropolitan state to slavery's defense."[13] In the North, slaves followed "the example of former slaves" and fled,

---

[9] Sinha, *The Slave's Cause*, 15; Warren, *New England Bound*, 229.

[10] Sinha, *The Slaves Cause*, 13.

[11] Bernard Bailyn, *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution* (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press, 1992), 232, 241. Quote on 241.

[12] Arthur Zilversmit, *The First Emancipation: The Abolition of Slavery in the North* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967), 66-78.

[13] Berlin, *Generations of Captivity*, 99.

primarily to northern cities. Free African Americans in the North also adopted the language of universal freedom and liberation of "family, friends, and indeed anyone who had shared with them the bitter fruits of bondage." In northern states, the presence of British soldiers in some of the major cities, like Philadelphia and New York, provided magnets for escaping slaves.[14]

The possibilities of freedom represented by the British extended into middle Appalachia. Western Maryland was the perfect location for keeping prisoners of war, both Maryland and the surrounding colonies utilized the facilities there. A black girl who worked with the prisoners held there saw her chance and used it: she provided ink and paper to work out an escape attempt, which was only avoided at the last moment according to reports at the time. Fear in middle Appalachia of slaves and servants caused them to also be warned not to go far from their owners without written permission or they would receive "thirty lashes on the bare back well laid."[15]

The combination of religious and ideological attacks on slavery were not enough to undermine the institution; it also required economic incentives. Manumission of slaves relied primarily upon economic circumstances; a rule that applied to both individual emancipators and to the gradual emancipation law passed by Pennsylvania in 1780. As Gary Nash and Jean Soderlund argue, "[a] morally based ideological movement could gain little ground when it required material sacrifices or inconvenience".[16] The economic necessity of unfree labor in greater Philadelphia also undermined slavery; an important reason that many easterners supported gradual emancipation while westerners opposed. Indeed, the combination of economic incentives, changing economics of the region, the decline in slave ownership, and the

---

[14] Ibid., 103.

[15] Bernard C. Steiner, "Western Maryland in the Revolution," 29, 42. Quote on page 29.

[16] Nash and Soderlund, *Freedom by Degrees*, 66.

general religious and ideological arguments proved too much and the political support for the institution of slavery in Pennsylvania collapsed.[17]

Like others in the state, the people of middle Appalachia opposed the gradual emancipation act due to the presence of Virginian slaveholders in the region. Unique in Pennsylvania, this far western part of the state had seen substantial immigration from slaveholding Virginia—the region itself was split between settlers who supported Virginia's claims to the areas around Pittsburgh and those who supported Pennsylvania's claims. In order to establish control over the western regions of Pennsylvania, the Pennsylvania state government enacted policies aimed at mollifying the Virginia adherents. The legislature of Pennsylvania enacted a law that provided citizenship to Virginia adherents and gave an allowance to the people of Washington and Westmoreland counties to have more time to register their slaves under the 1780 law. After all, those in this region believed they lived in Virginia and therefore had never thought they needed to register their slaves with Pennsylvania.[18]

The primary opposition to the gradual emancipation act came from those who opposed the Quaker faction in the east and came primarily from the back counties, primarily those in western Pennsylvania which included all of middle Appalachia. Ethnicity, geography, and religion all played a role in the opposition to the bill. As Robert Brunhouse shows, the arguments against gradual emancipation were religious in nature but economics played an important role as the majority of slaveholders in the assembly voted against it.[19]

---

[17] Ibid., 61-71.

[18] Robert L. Brunhouse, *The Counter-Revolution in Pennsylvania, 1776-1790* (Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Historical Commission, 1942), 112.

[19] Ibid., 80-81.

Indeed, the resistance from southwestern Pennsylvania intensified and caused a socioeconomic change in the region in large part because slaveholders who suddenly found themselves on the wrong side of the boarder sold their lands and moved south, safely back into slave-friendly states.[20] This is not to say that there were not conflicts in western Pennsylvania after these settlers left, quite the contrary. Middle Appalachians found themselves struggling with the Indians that supported the British to the west, political opponents in the east whose legal and constitutional outlook on Pennsylvania was different than westerners, and economic troubles, which included lack of hard money, markets for export, and infrastructure, at home. However, the creation of the new border between slavery and freedom would prove to be a porous one, both of conflict but also increasingly tightening connections in middle Appalachia.

The prevalence of slaveownership in the settlers in middle Appalachia among those who believed themselves to still be in the southern, or Chesapeake states, is important to understand both revolutionary politics in the region but also the understanding of social development. George Washington, a large slaveowner in Virginia with a keen interest in western lands, owned property in what became Fayette County, Pennsylvania. Letters received and sent during Washington's tenure as commander of the American armies during the Revolutionary War show how difficult it was for land- and labor-owners in a frontier region to maintain control over their property as issues of control and conflict with Native Americans continued. Moreover, as historian Wilma Dunaway has shown, it also shows how Appalachia was targeted for investments from outside sources. The investment in land and labor in the sparsely settled region would be an area of interest and contest in future decades. [21]

---

[20] Ibid., 81.

[21] Dunaway, *The First American Frontier*, esp. Chapter 3.

Washington received letters from Valentine Crawford, who worked as his agent in the region, describes Washington's issues of dealing with maintaining control over the laborers on his property in middle Appalachia, an issue that was common throughout the region during the Revolution. From May through July 1774, Washington received five letters from Crawford discussing the "servants". In letters in May and June, Crawford told Washington of opportunities to sell those servants to other people. Evidence in the letter suggests that Washington had about a dozen men, women, and children which he owned. By July, Crawford managed to sell all but one, who escaped and for which a reward was advertised in a local newspaper. Crawford also discusses the problems of Dunmore's War and Indian attacks in the region during the Revolution, as several servants ran and hid in Indian villages but were retaken shortly thereafter.[22]

The struggle for property, both land and people, and the struggle to maintain family and control of life and labor, are central to understanding middle Appalachia. As Daniel A. Barr argues, "the region was a divided ground, a contentious space in which competition for land, unrelenting warfare, and a struggle for power defined the contours of life." While Barr speaks specifically of the Indian wars that affected the region from the mid-eighteenth century until the 1780s, it can also be applied to how those settlers in the regions, both free and unfree, struggled in a region defined, particularly during the Revolution, as a region consumed by an Indian War.[23]

Pennsylvania, upon its passage of the gradual emancipation act in 1780, became a hub for abolitionism as its status as the first state of begin the elimination of slavery dovetailed with

[22] Franklin Ellis, *History of Fayette County, Pennsylvania: with biographical sketches of many of its pioneers and prominent men* (Philadelphia: L. H. Everts & Co., 1882), 125-26.

[23] Barr, *A Colony Sprung from Hell*, 194.

the revival of the Pennsylvania Abolition Society in 1784, creating the development of the largest antislavery organization in the United States. After the incorporation of the Pennsylvania Abolition Society (PAS) in 1784, it essentially functioned as the nation's first freedman's bureau, because they believed that blacks needed help in the transition from bondage to freedom. PAS officials actively fought for the protection of blacks and for black self-improvement through education and relief initiatives. They also emphasized prosecution of slaveholders who maintained their slaves in violation of the law, i.e. not registering them.[24]

Importantly, antislavery organizations formed throughout the state and linked with the PAS, creating an even stronger network of information and action against the institution of slavery that had already been slated for death. In Washington County, newly formed in 1781, residents formed the "Washington Society for the Relief of Free Negroes & others unlawfully held in bondage" in 1789, using the PAS as an example. They did so because, at the southwest corner of the state, they wished to end "the traffic in negroes & the abuse of them, [which] have been carried to great excess and where opinions unworthy of men have taken deep root…" Furthermore, they were ashamed by the "passive conduct" and "silence" of the residents of the region and wished to work with the broader antislavery movement.[25] Therefore, the creation of the Washington County Society illustrates that residents realized how widespread both racism and the illegal traffic of blacks in bondage and that they seen themselves as connected to the larger network of national and transatlantic antislavery movements.

[24] Ibid., 117-128.

[25] "From the Society for the relief of free Negroes & others unlawfully held in Bondage, lately established in Washington County in this State," Washington, February 7th, 1789. Reel 11. Papers of the Pennsylvania Abolition Society, *HSP*

At issue here for both North and South was sectional integrity. For many in the South, the issue of fugitive slaves became one that nagged from the late eighteenth century until the Civil War. For northerners, who thought of their section as "the free states", the kidnapping issue served the same role. In periods of heightened national sensitivity over the slavery issue, such as during the War of 1812 or the Missouri Crisis of 1819-1820, these issues became even more pronounced, particularly as they were often combined with other politically charged issues that were both connected to and separated from slavery, like the overrepresentation of slave states in the national government.[26]

However, as Pennsylvania moved towards eliminating slavery, the Maryland portion of Middle Appalachia remained slave country. The same abolitionist rhetoric that had galvanized Pennsylvanians against slavery caused many in Maryland, Virginia, and Delaware to do the same. Marylanders joined the national abolition movement in 1789 with the formation of the "Maryland Society for Promoting the Abolition of Slavery, for promoting the Abolition of Slavery, and for the Relief of Free Negroes, and Others, unlawfully held in Bondage." Unlike the much larger PAS, the Maryland Society was both small and short-lived. Also unlike the PAS, the Maryland organization allowed for slaveholders to become members like other southern antislavery organizations and including New York. Indeed, it is probably because of this laxity in Maryland and other southern states that caused their organizations to be so short-lived, which was combined with Gabriel's Rebellion in Virginia in 1800 to completely undermined antislavery movements in southern states.[27] The PAS and the Maryland Society did

[26] Matthew Mason, *Slavery and Politics in the Early American Republic* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2006), 7.

[27] Locke, *Anti-slavery in America*, 99-101; Wolf, *Race and Liberty in the New Nation*, 117-120.

interact as Maryland joined into a burgeoning, if still informal, national movement. In 1791, the Maryland Society acknowledged the receipt of books from the PAS that they "returned the thanks" for the books. Moreover, the Maryland Society was also present at early American Conventions of Abolition Societies.

Advocates of gradual abolition realized that ideology and religion alone would not convince northerners to support gradualist schemes—economic arguments and compensation needed to be used. Gradual emancipation programs across the North put the economic burden of emancipation on the slaves, not the slave-owners. In Pennsylvania, by freeing only future slaves after the age of twenty-eght ensured that the prime of their working life would be spent in unfree labor, essentially compensating the owner for his losses after the child achieved freedom. Moreover, this system shows that those who supported this type of legislation were more concerned with the burden of slave owning more than the slaves themselves. This shifting of the economic burden from the slaveowners to the enslaved is what Fogel and Engerman call "philanthropy at bargain prices".[28]

The economic calculations were important for slaveholders. In middle Appalachia, for instance, some who considered themselves Virginians but who did not want to live in antislavery Pennsylvania left the region, while others, like Hutton and her family, moved in. Almost certainly, economic calculations went into their decisions to move into Pennsylvanian middle Appalachia; the loss of future slaves born after their relocation for the opportunity to gain much more landholding than they could in the comparatively densely settled areas of non-Appalachian eastern Maryland. The length required for service after ostensible freedom under the 1780 law

[28] Fogel and Engerman, "Philanthropy at Bargain Prices: Notes on the Economics of Gradual Emancipation," 377-401.

was the longest of any state in the North, ensuring that their labor contributed to estates of people like Hutton and Cook.[29]

Hutton and her family were impelled to make this move most likely by both the temptation of cheap land and the changing economy of middle Appalachia. Unfree labor, particularly slavery, was changing in the Chesapeake during and immediately after the Revolutionary War also. Slavery did not receive the death blow of legal gradual emancipation, but the economic and social changes occurring in the Chesapeake, and Maryland in particular, changed how slavery operated. The economy of the Upper South changed after the Revolution from a monoculture to one focused on grain production. Because of this, the need for large numbers of slaves, necessary for the production of tobacco, disappeared. Because of this excess of slaves, Virginians and Marylanders became champions of the interstate slave trade while also hardening restrictions on if and how slaves were granted freedom, caused by Gabriel's Rebellion.[30] Both Virginia and Maryland show how, after the Revolution, there was a retrenchment of race and slavery due to the social and economic changes caused by the Revolutionary years. In Virginia, there were debates about ending slavery after the Revolution but nothing was done for fear of the number of free blacks this would produce, the fear of control for those free blacks (and those kept in slavery), and issues of class, namely how poor whites responded economically and socially to it. The debates flared up in Virginia and Maryland roughly over the same reasons: class divide and east-west divides along with Gabriel's Rebellion in 1800. In the forty years

[29] Nash and Soderlund, *Freedom by Degrees*, 99-101.

[30] Berlin, *Many Thousands Gone*, 256, 266-67.

after the Revolution, slaveowners would use the promise of emancipation to extract labor and obedience from their slaves, essentially reinforcing the structures of slavery in that state.[31]

For the intersection of class and race, the 1780s proved to be an important foundational decade. As Wilma Dunaway explains, social movement was difficult for smallholders and landless people in the Appalachians. Speaking specifically of the Southern Appalachians, Dunaway argues that there are "three harsh realities" that those seeking advancement faced: first, land was heavily concentrated; second, there were few entrepreneurial opportunities and agricultural employment was seasonal; and third, those who supplemented their agricultural work with professional or specialized skills tended to be the ones who moved up.[32]

Middle Appalachia bucks the trend, however, in employment opportunities but not in concentration. As women like Margaret Hutton and men like William Goe move into the region, buying up large tracts of land in prime agricultural areas, they are representative of many investors and speculators, both present and absentee, that begin to dominate landholdings in the region. Importantly, this occurs in both Pennsylvania and Maryland, so the distinct regionalization of Southern Appalachia does not apply here.[33]

This is also because slaveowners in Maryland were good at using their slaves efficiently. Maryland slaveowners managed their workforce by combining agricultural and small craft works on the plantation along with hiring out slaves in surrounding cities or towns. While Maryland

---

[31] Eva Sheppard Wolf, *Race and Liberty in the New Nation*, x, 39; T. Stephen Whitman, *Challenging Slavery in the Chesapeake: Black and White Resistance to Human Bondage, 1775-1865* (Baltimore: Maryland Historical Society, 2007), 49.

[32] Dunaway, *Slavery in the American Mountain South*, 44-45.

[33] I am referring to land purchase records by the Hutton-Magruder-Goe family among others here. I am also referencing a future topic of discussion that will occur in Chapter 4, namely the attempt to create an iron manufacturer in the region.

never forbade the out-of-state sale of slaves, slaveowners could use the threat of slave and the promise of freedom to get more work. Slaves could also have the ability to "cash out" or, in their manumission documents, be required to work for a set amount of time. Here Maryland slaveowners, particularly in the heavily plantation areas, had an advantage over those residing in the bordering free states: they could sell slaves in large numbers that the "Georgia men", or interstate slave traders, were looking for.[34]

After the Revolution in Maryland, essentially two different societies existed simultaneously: one white and one black. The existence of two Marylands caused friction, which eroded but did not destroy slavery in that state, challenged the political, moral, and ideological frameworks that was supposed to represent a slave society. There was also political and social tension between southern Maryland, whose economy relied heavily upon slavery for production of tobacco, and Baltimore and western Maryland, whose economy began to change along lines of the rest of the Chesapeake. The final area of friction for slavery in Maryland was the fact that it sat along the Mason-Dixon Line, allowing for this border of freedom to undermine slavery in the state.[35]

When Hutton and her family moved into middle Appalachia, their move was already effected by the 1780 gradual emancipation law because they had to register the children born to Sarah, Hannah, Susanna, and Nogee. The 1780 act was part of a broader system of unfree labor laws that were created throughout the eighteenth century in both Maryland and Pennsylvania. These laws had a fundamental impact on how middle Appalachia developed from the 1790s forward as the legal foundations of free and unfree labor in the late eighteenth century dictated

[34] Ibid., 53.

[35] Barbara Jeanne Fields, *Slavery and Freedom in the Middle Ground*, xi, 17, 41-42; Grivno, *Gleanings of Freedom*, 37.

much of the nineteenth century's growth. Examining these laws also shows how unfree labor and ideas about laws changed during the eighteenth century which forms cultural, legal, and political baggage that the second wave settlers bring into middle Appalachia. Thus, people like Margaret Hutton had to contend with finding enough labor, whether it is free or unfree.

Part of the process of creating two Marylands was the rise of manumissions in the Chesapeake after the Revolution. The combination of revolutionary ideology, religion, and economic opportunity led to the rise of the free black population in Maryland. The western and northern regions of Maryland incorporated slavery slowly and nowhere near the levels of the eastern tobacco regions of Maryland. These areas, along with Baltimore, used slavery in different ways but they were no less important as a labor source than in more concentrated regions, and indeed, the growth of slavery in the western two counties of Maryland reflect this growing need. Slaves were predominantly agricultural laborers, although their concentration in the towns if middle Appalachia also speaks to their utility as domestic and skilled laborers too.[36]

In states like Maryland and Virginia where slavery survived institutionally, manumission played an important role, not just in raising the free black population but also in reinforcing the institution of slavery. At the same time that liberal ideas about liberty and equality were percolating through society, the economic necessity of slavery, particularly after the disruptions of the Revolution, reinforced slavery. Manumissions, spurred by moral, religious, and economic reasons, were used as much to signify these ideas of the Revolution as they were to reinforce the institution of slavery.[37] Indeed, slaveowners by the 1790s began to see the practice of manumission as a way to encourage slaves to work harder.

---

[36] Barbara Jeanne Fields, *Slavery and Freedom in the Middle Ground*, xi, 17, 41-42; Grivno, *Gleanings of Freedom*, 37.

[37] Eva Sheppard Wolf, *Race and Liberty in the New Nation*, 39.

In Margaret Hutton's will, for instance, there is a promise of freedom at her death for her older slaves, assuming she does not sell them before her death. The promise of freedom in this case is mixed with the threat of sale that ensured good behavior for her slaves. Unfortunately, for her slaves in their teens and early twenties, they were required to serve a certain number of years each before they gained their freedom and ostensibly were also required to learn a trade. Hutton's will is part of a tradition of slaveowners understanding freedom as a way to shore up slavery.[38]

For middle Appalachia, manumission records are nonexistent in either Maryland or Pennsylvania. There are a variety of reasons for this but primarily it is the relatively low number of slaves in the region combined with the lack of government reach into this sparsely populated region to record the manumissions. Despite the creation of antislavery organizations in Maryland and Pennsylvania, and even a branch in Pennsylvanian middle Appalachia, there are no cases in which they participated in a manumission case or recorded manumissions. The legal development that led to the practice of individual (and sometimes mass) manumissions was established and the debated throughout the eighteenth century; the practice of using it to reinforce slave was put into great effect in the late eighteenth century—a practice that paid off for middle Appalachians beginning in the 1790s.

The legal development of manumission and slavery in Maryland occurred along the same lines of Virginia. In 1715, following Virginia's lead, the Maryland colonial assembly created a law which made slavery an inheritable condition following the line of the mother. The law also provided for the early racialization of slavery by punishing interracial sexual relations and

---

[38] Ancestry.com. *Pennsylvania, Wills and Probate Records, 1683-1993* [database on-line]. Provo, UT, USA: Ancestry.com Operations, Inc., 2015. Will of Margaret Hutton, p. 112-119.

ensuring that mixed children would become servants for seven years (if the mother was white) along with the mother. In the 1750s, the legal killing of slaves by owners and the state were legalized, provided if the state should do it then the owner was to be compensated provided the slave acted rebellious (although the term rebellious was defined broadly. Moreover, in 1753, a law was passed that any person accused of killing a slave (not the owner) "for the general peace" and be acquitted, the "public shall pay the Costs of the Prosecution" and if any sheriff at the county level did not uphold this law they would be fined "five pounds tobacco". In that same year, the legislature enacted a law that restricted individual manumissions, placing more burdens on the act to slow the growth of the free population.[39]

The legislature reaffirmed the 1753 law regarding manumissions in the 1780s, though Maryland antislavery forces resisted it. William Pinkney, a native Marylander active in state politics during the writing of the Maryland state constitution, was a member of the ratification convention for the United States Constitution, and served as a delegate in the House of Delegates of Maryland from 1788 to 1792. In his speech condemning the reaffirmation of the 1752 law, Pinkney used language developed during the Revolution condemning slavery, invoked Enlightenment thinkers on the nature of slavery and government, the nature of blacks in slavery, and ultimately, rejecting several arguments put forth against manumissions. He argued that "you are not called upon, at this time, to compel an emancipation of your slaves. For such a measure I am no advocate…" but that former legislatures had "thrown up an insuperable mound against he gently current of humanity…without on rational argument." After this speech there were few

[39] "Memoranda of Laws in relation to Slavery, in the United States," Reel 25. Papers of the Pennsylvania Abolition Society, *HSP*.

objections to the amendment of the colonial law, and it allowed for the manumission of slaves in last wills and testaments.[40]

Unlike Pennsylvania, slavery was well established in Maryland by the time of the Revolution as it remained critical to the state's tobacco economy and had turned the state into a slave society versus the society with slaves that Pennsylvania remained throughout the eighteenth century. However, much like Virginia, Maryland's economy had undergone a massive shift around the time of the war— the tobacco monoculture transformed into more profitable grain production and the need for slaves diminished. Combined with the large numbers of free blacks already present in the state and the increase seen in the near future due to legal manumissions, Maryland legislators took action against the importation of further slaves into the state to avoid an increase in the black population. In 1783, the Maryland legislature passed "An Act to prohibit the bringing Slaves into this State", which forbade bringing slaves into the state of Maryland and the penalty for this was that those slaves would go free as long as they "had a bona fide intention of selling".[41] A law similar to this was enacted in Virginia in 1778; allowing for many of the same provisions.[42] The reason for this is twofold: first, a surplus of slaves that plagued Virginia and Maryland well into the nineteenth century stemming from economic changes—lowering the supply would increase the value of slaves already present in the state. The second reason, however, was because of the hardening racial attitudes of the period. The fear of slave revolt

[40] Pinkney, William. "Speech of William Pinkney, Esq., in the House of Delegates of Maryland, at their session in November 1789." *Princeton University Digital Library*. Accessed from http://pudl.princeton.edu/objects/bz60cx01b#page/20/mode/2up (accessed June 7, 2017), p. 20-22.

[41] Ibid., 20-22

[42] "An act for preventing further importation of Slaves" in William Waller Hening, *Statutes at Large of Virginia: Being a Collection of all the Laws of Virginia from the first session of the Legislature, in the year 1619*. Transcribed by Freddie L. Spradlin. Accessed from http://vagenweb.org/hening/vol09.htm (accessed July 16, 2017), 471-72

stemming from the Revolution and white desire to escape the problem of African Americans, free or enslaved, was one that both states came to terms with. This problem, however, only became exacerbated by the proximity of the border of freedom represented by the Pennsylvania border.[43]

The growing concern over the place of slavery in Maryland in this rapidly changing economic environment brought legislators to further tighten restrictions on slaves. In 1787, for instance, the state limited slave's ability to hire themselves out in an act called "An act to prevent the Inconveniences arising from Slaves being permitted to act as free." The Maryland legislature here punished both slaveowner and the hirer of slaves who attempted to do this.[44] It was also an attempt to secure a means for landless men who could not compete with slave labor. Thus, put in the light of the social problems (which included the agitation of poor whites in both urban and rural areas) of the states in the late eighteenth century, the beginnings of a conscientious policy of promoting free labor while also protecting the institution of slavery which was degrading in Maryland.[45]

Pennsylvania's assemblies adopted laws regarding slaves, servants, and blacks in the colonies but unlike in Maryland, which tried to construct a stable slave regime, the goal in Pennsylvania was different. Relatively early in the eighteenth century, Pennsylvania established

---

[43] See Robert G. Parkinson, *The Common Cause: Creating Race and Nation in the American Revolution* (Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 2016) for a discussion of these hardening attitudes brought on by the creation of a "common cause".

[44] "Memoranda of Laws in relation to Slavery, in the United States" Reel 25. Papers of the Pennsylvania Abolition Society, *HSP*.

[45] There is legislative evidence of this social problem throughout the 1780s and 1790s in Maryland with acts of the assembly like "An Act for the relief of the poor of Queen-Anne's county" passed throughout the period. William Kilty, *The laws of Maryland: to which are prefixed the original charter…*, 1501. Early State Records Online, *(MSA)*. Accessed from http://aomol.msa.maryland.gov/megafile/msa/speccol/sc4800/sc4872/003150/html/m3150-1342.html (accessed August 7, 2017)

laws that forbade the importation of Indian slaves into the colony and established procedures for the trial of blacks accused of crimes, which if the bill is to be believed, were on the rise in the colony. The abolition of the Indian slave trade is understandable; Indian slaves were important but relatively minor in Pennsylvania. Most of the servants came from Europe and most slaves came from Africa. By 1712, moreover, the colonial assembly banned the importation of slaves (Indian or black) from New York. This was in response to the abortive slave rebellion in New York in that same year. The colony also established duties on "Negroes" imported into the colony later that decade.[46]

It was also in 1712 that a petition was presented to the colonial legislature that to abolish slavery in the colony; a petition that was presented by a former Marylander, William Southeby, largely due to his Quaker beliefs and the violence inherent in slavery. The petition was rejected because it was "neither just nor convenient to set them at Liberty." Instead, the assembly set a prohibitive duty on slave imports. The legislature constantly reaffirmed this prohibitive duty laid upon slave imports into the colony throughout the century and it effectively limited slavery's possible increase. The actions on taxing importations of slaves shows that the value and number of slaves was increasing in and around Philadelphia; a trend that continued throughout the eighteenth century, although the importation of slaves waxed and waned with the needs of the colonial economy and military conflicts, such as the Seven Years' War, particularly when it came to the supply of indentured servants.[47]

[46] "Laws of Pennsylvania in regard to slaves, 1700-1793" Reel 25. Papers of the Pennsylvania Abolition Society, *HSP*. For the effect of the slave rebellion, see Nash and Soderlund, *Freedom by Degrees,* 41.

[47]"Laws of Pennsylvania in regard to slaves, 1700-1793" Reel 25. Papers of the Pennsylvania Abolition Society, *HSP*. Nash and Soderlund, *Freedom by Degrees*, 42.

The relative dearth of laws regarding slavery and unfree laborers is even more evident with the 1780 gradual abolition law, which shifted the ground under the already-destabilized institution. The passage of the law and the legal and social legacies of unfree labor and slavery were transmitted into a newly created borderland. Just as importantly, the legal apparatus of slave and free labor in Pennsylvania and Maryland helped to create two middle Appalachias. One was a region that still contained, and at least partially depended upon, unfree laborers. The second is one in which free labor, struggle though it can be for the poor on the quickly growing frontier, and is also a goal of the new state governments. For both blacks and whites, then, settling in middle Appalachia, despite the role of the border in conflict, was attractive both for easterners and just as importantly, for fugitives from the south.

The 1780 Pennsylvania Gradual Abolition Act is in counterpoint to the laws passed in Maryland during the last two decades of the eighteenth century, which stabilized an institution that was declining in broad terms in the state. This differentiation created a borderland that had profound effects on the role of slaves in the economy and the ability of slaveholders to maintain control of their property. In middle Appalachia, an area new to development though, this borderland looked quite different as slavery was not declining. From 1790 until 1830, the number of slaves grew in absolute terms in the two western counties of Maryland. In Pennsylvania, the numbers of those counted as enslaved on censuses declined through 1830. Thus, unfree labor continued to be important in middle Appalachia well into the antebellum period.[48]

[48] U.S. Census Bureau. Total Population Density, 1790. Prepared by Social Explorer. (accessed October 16, 2016); .S. Census Bureau. Total Population Density, 1800. Prepared by Social Explorer. (accessed October 16, 2016); .S. Census Bureau. Total Population Density, 1810. Prepared by Social Explorer. (accessed October 16, 2016); .S. Census Bureau. Total Population Density, 1820. Prepared by Social Explorer. (accessed October 16, 2016); .S. Census Bureau. Total Population Density, 1830. Prepared by Social Explorer. (accessed October 16, 2016)

The borderland between slavery and freedom has been a subject of study for historians who sought to show how the borderland operated socially, economically, and politically after the passage of the 1780 law. It was not only legal but social and cultural influences that created a borderland in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. As Matthew Salafia argues about the Ohio River as a borderland, and which applies to middle Appalachia, that region was a region defined by its blend of influences, both north and south.[49]

There are two key parts of understanding slavery in a borderland like that which developed in middle Appalachia. The first is that political leaders and communities enforced racial boundaries in communities along these borderlands; secondly, the importance and interchangeability of unfree labor in the functioning of the local economy, and third, how the proximity to Free states ensured friction for slaves and slaveowners.[50]

Middle Appalachia represents an important piece of studies for the long borderland, which extended from the Atlantic to west of the Mississippi, for a variety of reasons. First, it was a place that existed along an artificial boundary. Unlike the Ohio River, there was not definite geographical feature either slaves or whites to view as a definite border between free and slave states, as the Ohio River further west. Second, the role of middle Appalachia as a route west, particularly to states that are both free and enslaved. The Northwest Ordinance of 1787, which forbade the entry of slaves into the Northwest Territories, extended a borderland west that already existed in middle Appalachia.[51] Finally, the fugitive slave issue was critical to this

[49] Matthew Salafia, *Slavery's Borderland: Freedom and Bondage along the Ohio River* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013), 2.

[50] Ibid., 4-12.

[51] Ibid., 42.

region, which was home to important avenues in the Underground Railroad and which consumed much of the political and social relations of the region.[52]

This region was also inherently a place of conflict, volatile because, as Stanley Harrold argues, borderlands are a place "where contrasting economic, political, and cultural forces compete, interact, and clash" especially in regions where there was no natural boundary, such as in middle Appalachia.[53] Forms of violence, political, social, and actual violence, grew out of the proximity of peoples in which free and slave labor societies are in close contact.[54] In the case of middle Appalachia, a region in which unfree labor was used well into the antebellum period even in Pennsylvania, it formed an ideological borderland too; a place where the idea of a white man's country came into contact with the practical applications of unfree labor in the economy and the presence of numbers of African Americans throughout the communities of the borderlands.[55]

The notion of a white man's republic is important for this region. The expansion of slavery in middle Appalachia occurred in a political economy, particularly in Pennsylvania, which opposed slavery while at the same time using unfree labor, including slaves and indentured servants, alongside free, wage laborers, outside of state and regional economic and legal trends.[56] In a region focused on investment and development and included both

[52] David G. Smith, *On the Edge of Freedom*, 9-10.

[53] Stanley Harrold, *Border War*, 2.

[54] Ibid., xiii.

[55] Michael B. McCoy, "Forgetting Freedom: White Anxiety, Black Presence, and Gradual Abolition in Cumberland County, Pennsylvania, 1780-1838"; Willis L. Shirk, Jr., "Testing the Limits of Tolerance: Blacks and the Social Order in Columbia, Pennsylvania, 1800-1851" *Pennsylvania History*, Vol. 60, No. 1 (January 1993): 35-50; Harper, R. Eugene, *The Transformation of Western Pennsylvania, 1770-1800*, 53-55; Christopher M. Osborne, "Invisible Hands: Slaves, Bound Laborers, and the Development of Western Pennsylvania, 1780-1820,"; Matthew Mason, *Slavery and Politics.*

[56] Matthew Mason shows that this work on both a political and social level by examining the role in which sectional orthodoxy masked the intrasectional disputes over the issue of slavery. Understanding both the need and use of

agricultural and non-agricultural production, people saw unfree labor not as a luxury but as a necessity to their own economic success. As the legal development of slavery in Maryland shows, unfree labor remained important and there was a ready source of labor to be bought from surrounding states, ensuring a relatively constant supply.

Economic, social, and political connections were constructed beginning in the 1780s and the 1790s but continuing through the nineteenth century across middle Appalachia.[57] If the ties that bound the region together grew stronger, so did the issues arising out of the artificial border between Pennsylvania and Maryland. The creation of the Washington County antislavery society, which adjuncted itself to the PAS in 1789, had its' first case that same year. In a letter sent in 1789, the Washington County society sent a letter detailing that John, a free black in Washington County, was taken with "force & arms & a strong hand, assaulted, seized, imprisoned, bound & carried without the Jurisdiction of the Commonwealth" and Francis McGuire, Baldwin Parsons and Absolom Wells were brought up on indictment. They were not caught but instead successfully "fled from Justice, taking with them Negroe John" and that they may have "taken shelter in the State of Virginia" or perhaps into "a new State by the name of Kentucky." John, at the time of the memorial sent to… was currently being held in slavery near Romney, "on the South branch of the Powtowmach."[58]

In 1790, PAS agents ascertained that John was being held in Virginia and set up a meeting with the owner to discuss the case. The meeting did not go well because the PAS agents

---

slavery along with antislavery sentiments in middle Appalachia follows along with the concept of these sectional vs. intrasectional debate. Mason, *Slavery and Politics,* 6-7.

[57] These will be discussed further in Chapters 3 and 4.

[58] "To Thomas Mifflin, Governor of Pennsylvania, The Memorial of the Pennsylvania Society…" 1791. Reel 1. Papers of the Pennsylvania Abolition Society, *HSP*. The discrepancy in times is because this memorial was sent to Governor Mifflin in 1791, while the petition from the Washington County society, was sent in 1789.

decided to write the slaveowner's member of Congress "respecting the safest & most expeditious mode of restoring the person who is the subject of the Memorial to liberty." Importantly, the question of John's freedom was in question, for he claimed freedom under the 1780 law but his owner, who claimed an exemption, hired him out to a Virginian.[59]

This touched of what Steven Lubet has called the first "state-on-state confrontation". After a Pennsylvania court had indicted the slavecatchers, Pennsylvania Governor Thomas Mifflin forwarded it to Virginia Governor Beverley Randolph, who failed to comply with the request. Governor Mifflin then contacted President Washington, who forwarded the petition to Congress. Lubet argues that this, in part, led to a section of the Fugitive Slave Law of 1793 that deals specifically with runaways who were hired out across state bounds.[60]

If this region represented a cultural and political borderland, with the inherent forms of violence contained in those, it also represented an economic borderland. Using the non-Appalachian border counties of Maryland, Max Grivno explores the role of the border in creating an economic system that depended upon mixed labor forces, in which varied backgrounds and legal statuses defied or muddied distinctions between slavery and freedom. Symptomatic of larger economic transformations of the region, particularly in Maryland, the fluidity of these labor arrangements exposed how employers were willing to exploit various forms of labor for maximum economic effect while continuing the ideological certainty of a white man's country.[61]

The expansion of slavery into northern Maryland in Grivno's study mirrors the expansion in middle Appalachia with two caveats: first, the use of slaves in various economic enterprises,

---

[59] Steven Lubet, *Fugitive Justice: Runaways, Rescuers, and Slavery on Trial* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010), 20; Reel 21. Papers of the Pennsylvania Abolition Society, *HSP*.

[60] Lubet, *Fugitive Justice*, 20-21.

[61] Max Grivno, *Gleanings of Freedom*, 28-31.

including not just agriculture but in industries, both productive and extractive, and commercial activities. Slavery grew in northern Maryland because of planter migrations from the tobacco counties of Virginia but with the changing economy, changes in labor structures and legal codes followed. In Maryland, much as in Pennsylvania, indentured servitude withered away for whites, and in Maryland, state, county, and municipal governments constructed legal frameworks to discipline labor forces. The dismantling, in large part, of unfree labor for whites reflects both the growing disdain for the institution among whites who considered themselves living in a white man's country along with the growing reliance upon slavery and "patchwork workforces," in Grivno's phrase.[62]

Slaves and slavery were critical to the development of middle Appalachia, both in terms of their labor and in their presence in the region. In Pennsylvania, slavery withered rapidly during the early republic, particularly in the eastern portion of the state due to the combined legal pressure of the 1780 law and the activities of the PAS. Slaveowners who arrived in the state oftentimes found their hold on slaves endangered both by legal circumstances and by the activities of the slaves themselves, many who sought to self-emancipate through both legal and nonlegal means.

In 1790, Margaret Hutton became the largest slaveowner in Fayette County (her husband died shortly after arriving in Pennsylvania). Her brother William Goe was the second largest.[63] Speculators and settlers, Hutton was able to develop her estates even further after her husband

[62] Ibid., 43, 51, 56-59; Dunaway, *The First American Frontier*, 87.

[63] 1790 Census, Fayette County. This is a guess for the date Magruder died. The only time he appears in any record I can find is for a registration of slave children owned by his wife, Margaret Hutton, in which it simply says "Capt. A. Magruder, deceased…" RG-47 Birth Records for the County Governments, Fayette County Prothonotary. Birth Records for Negroes and Mulattoes, 1788-1826; Ancestry.com. *Pennsylvania, Land Warrants and Applications, 1733-1952* [database on-line]. Provo, UT, USA: Ancestry.com Operations, Inc., 2012.

died, no doubt with the aid of her brother and nephew. In the 1790 census, Fayette County registered 282 slaves and 44 free blacks. Therefore, the second wave settlers included a sizeable number of blacks, although as is often the case, for many African Americans, it was an unfree movement.[64]

This is important, because this region has usually been envisioned as entirely free and white, built by small farmers, commercial and industrial entrepreneurs, with some land speculation entering the equation.[65] While some recent historians have begun to change the conservation, their efforts have focused almost entirely on Southern Appalachia.[66] Moreover, the African Americans that moved into this region generally settled around towns, particularly as many attained freedom from slavery. African Americans, whether free, enslaved, or fugitive, were generally accepted into the region, even into the nineteenth century, as laborers in the burgeoning agricultural and industrial economies. Some African Americans, particularly in the service and mercantile industries, were able to attain both property and attain, at least in part, middle class status. For many whites, especially poor whites, the success of their black neighbors was a point of contention and proved a focal point of racial tensions.[67]

---

[64] The literature for unfree movement, or forced migrations, is large. See Edward E. Baptist, *The Half Has Never Been Told* for the most recent accounting.

[65] Christopher M. Osborne, "Invisible Hands: Slaves, Bound Laborers, and the Development of Western Pennsylvania, 1780-1820," 77.

[66] See John Inscoe, *Mountain Masters: Slavery and the Sectional Crisis in Western North Carolina* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1989); Wilma Dunaway, *Slavery in the American Mountain South* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Wilma Dunaway, *The African-American Family in Slavery and Emancipation* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Wilma Dunaway, *The First American Frontier: Transition to Capitalism in Southern Appalachia, 1700-1860* (New York: University of North Carolina Press, 1996).

[67] Willis L. Shirk, Jr. "Testing the Limits of Tolerance: Blacks and the Social Order in Columbia, Pennsylvania, 1800-1851," 37-47; Harper, *Transformation of Western Pennsylvania*, 129.

The expansion of Hutton's estate and that of her family's is also important because of the time and place in which it is happening. After becoming a widow, in 1792, Hutton acquired over 300 acres along the Redstone Creek leading into the Monongahela River. This area was undergoing heavy settlement during the 1780s and 1790s; and this was a wise investment. Hutton also acquired land in Washington Township, another area that, following the trend of the rest of the region, was undergoing settlement and of interest for land speculators. Unfortunately, there is no record of what happened to her slaves nor her estate upon her death. According to the 1780 law, they should not have been taken or sold outside of the state but the record does not state their eventual fate.[68]

Moreover, excerpt for a small town plot, the land that she and her brothers bought was agricultural, or at least rural. This speaks to the economy of the time, particularly grain production, and the ability to get that to markets. While the 1790s witnessed agitation over grain and whiskey production due to a tax levied by Congress as part of Alexander Hamilton's economic plans the important of that is evidenced by the large investment in farmland, particularly in regions where there was already a lot of settlement by southerners who employed unfree laborers.[69]

Just as important is the breakdown in who owned those slaves and the children's' unfreedom. Where the records indicate, almost a third- 48- were born to farmers; this shows the importance of agriculture in the area during the last two decades of the eighteenth century. Fourteen children were born to slaves held by lawyers or other government officials, which

[68] Ancestry.com. *Pennsylvania, Land Warrants and Applications, 1733-1952* [database on-line]. Provo, UT, USA: Ancestry.com Operations, Inc., 2012.

[69] Ibid.

shows that owning slaves was an indication of concentrated wealth and political power in western Pennsylvania.[70] The recent historiography speaks of the necessity of slavery for economic development, particularly in urban and town centers. Studies of Philadelphia, Baltimore, and of the agricultural regions along the Mason-Dixon Line and the Ohio River all show the importance of slavery, even relatively small holdings, in the economy of those regions.[71]

One excellent example of this class of lawyers and government officials is Edward Cook. A contemporary of Margaret Hutton, Cook was a veteran of the Revolutionary War and colonial militia. He was heavily involved in the revolutionary war in southwestern Pennsylvania. While he was doing this, he was also building an estate in the region that made him one of the largest property holders and slaveholders. Indeed, it was to Edward Cook that Crawford Valentine, Washington's agent in Fayette County, sold two servants in 1776. By 1780, Cook owned eight slaves; including the two Washington's agent sold him.[72] Thus, in the 1790s, Cook became an integral member of the political, social, and economic climate of southwestern Pennsylvania and would become a supporter, then leader, then moderating influence on the Whiskey Rebellion. During the 1780s, Cook continued to grow his estate in southwestern Pennsylvania. He acquired three different tracts in Fayette County alone, nearly a thousand acres from 1784 to 1787.[73] He

---

[70] Harper, *Transformation of Western Pennslyvania*, 55; RG-47 Birth Records for the County Governments, Fayette County Prothonotary. Birth Records for Negroes and Mulattoes, 1788-1826, *PSA*.

[71] See Seth Rockman, *Scraping By*, Nash and Soderlund, *Freedom By Degrees*, Salafia, *Slavery's Borderland,* Grivno, *Gleanings of Freedom*, Richard C. Wade, *Slavery in the Cities: The South, 1820-1860* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967) for studies that show the extent and importance of slaveholding in cities and the borderland regions between slavery and freedom.

[72] Ellis, *History of Fayette County, Pennsylvania*, 126-128.

[73] Ancestry.com. *Pennsylvania, Land Warrants and Applications, 1733-1952* [database on-line]. Provo, UT, USA: Ancestry.com Operations, Inc., 2012.

also was instrumental in the creation of Fayette County and active in county government. By 1791, he was president and associate justice of the Court of Common Pleas.[74]

Two last categories show the significance of slavery and the transformations occurring in middle Appalachia during this period. One category are craftsman, of which five children were born to slaves and servants of that group, which shows that slavery could be used in all the economic sectors that came into prominence when this region developed. The final category are the men who registered slaves who were categorized as merchants. This is important for two reasons: first, this category only appears in the 1790s; and second, it shows that slaves were not only present in agricultural and craft production, but also in commerce in the local economy at a time when that economy was gradually being integrated into larger regional, state, and national developments.[75]

If part of the development of slavery is the use of the institution in various means of economic production, the other part is the rise of the free black community in western Pennsylvania. By 1800, in Fayette County, there are three independent black households. Two are listed as being headed by men and one by a woman. The rise of the free black community is important for several reasons in middle Appalachia. First, it shows that they are present in a region in which is only being settled relatively early on. Second, they are critical to the functioning of the Underground Railroad in middle Appalachia, which will play a critical role in the way slaves are able to self-emancipate during the antebellum period. Finally, free blacks were just as important as unfree members of the community in the functioning of the economy in

[74] Ellis, *History of Fayette County, Pennsylvania*, 151-52.

[75] RG-47 Birth Records for the County Governments, Fayette County Prothonotary. Birth Records for Negroes and Mulattoes, 1788-1826, *PSA*.

this region, for they provide labor in the agricultural, service, commercial, and industrial sectors.[76]

There were also significant mixed race households that do not have slaves present. There are a lot of explanations of this: indentured servants, servants, but just as importantly, a possibility that is briefly mentioned by Robert Ayres, an itinerant Methodist minister that traveled through the region in the 1780s, is that they represent interracial couples. Ayres recorded in his journal, "Here it may not be amiss to the Rader that I visited an object of charity last Friday, a white man whom her parents presented from marrying a young Man in England after she came to America She married a Negro Slave, & now being lame she cannot Walk now scarcely Stir but lies in a confined place…" No other evidence suggests the existence of this strange couple; although there are households in Fayette County headed by women that are mixed race. Moreover, these exist throughout the region, although not nearly in the concentration of Fayette County.[77]

The areas of middle Appalachia that fell into western Maryland fit the mold of development in southern Appalachia more closely but also reflect the culture of middle Appalachia for reasons that have already been discussed in this chapter. The slave population grew with the population and economic development of these two counties. However, it is

[76] Ancestry.com. *1800 United States Federal Census* [database on-line]. Provo, UT, USA: Ancestry.com Operations Inc, 2010. Second Census of the United States, 1800. NARA microfilm publication M32 (52 rolls). Records of the Bureau of the Census, Record Group 29. National Archives, Washington, D.C. Second Census of the United States, 1800: Population Schedules, Fayette County.

[77] Diary of Robert Ayres, Papers of Robert Ayres, Folder 3, Box 1. Papers of Robert Ayres, 1785-1837. Library and Archives Division, Senator John Heinz History Center.**;** Ancestry.com *1790 United States Federal Census* [database on-line]. Provo, UT, USA: Ancestry.com Operations Inc. 2010. First Census of the United States, 1790 (NARA microfilm publication M637, 12 rolls). Records of the Bureau of the Census, Record Group 29. National Archives, Washington, D.C., Fayette County.

important to see how quickly slavery became important in the last three decades of the eighteenth century in this region to understand how important it would remain and why free and enslaved blacks would remain important economic actors in middle Appalachia.

By 1790 in the two westernmost counties of Maryland, Washington and Allegany, have relatively small slave populations compared to the rest of Maryland but they are also much less settled and developed also. The 1780s mark a watershed settlement and development period for Allegany County especially, so the rise in slave numbers there show this. In Washington County, there are around 1,200 slaves registered in the census and in Allegany County, there are only about 250. In the ten years between 1790 and 1800, however, there is a significant increase in the slave population. In Washington County there was a fifty-four percent increase in the slave population to 2,200 slaves. In Allegany County, the slave population almost doubled, from around 250 to nearly 500. While these are not significant numbers when compared to the rest of Maryland, they are significant in the fact that unlike the rest of the Maryland counties, only these two show growth, and the growth is significant.[78]

These numbers show that the people who were setting in this region considered slavery, if not critical, then extremely useful in their settlement and development of the region. Middle Appalachia was home to a growing slave population which was used for every economic sector in the region, commercial, agricultural, and both productive and extractive industries. Moreover, their presence shows that while whites may have settled the region in line with the concept of

[78] Ancestry.com *1790 United States Federal Census* [database on-line]. Provo, UT, USA: Ancestry.com Operations Inc. 2010. First Census of the United States, 1790 (NARA microfilm publication M637, 12 rolls). Records of the Bureau of the Census, Record Group 29. National Archives, Washington, D.C., Washington County; Ancestry.com. *1800 United States Federal Census* [database on-line]. Provo, UT, USA: Ancestry.com Operations Inc, 2010. Second Census of the United States, 1800. NARA microfilm publication M32 (52 rolls). Records of the Bureau of the Census, Record Group 29. National Archives, Washington, D.C. Second Census of the United States, 1800: Population Schedules, Washington County

free labor, they are very much employing black labor, especially enslaved black labor, to develop the region.

The 1780s was a foundational period for middle Appalachia. The development of state, national, and international antislavery movements created a tectonic shift for slavery in the United States. Triggered by the Revolutionary period, antislavery agitation entered into a new phase and it connected middle Appalachia into this network. Combined with the creation of antislavery organizations and spreading sentiment was the shifting and hardening of racial attitudes as Americans (of the patriot persuasion) began to create their own identity in response to the enemies they faced in the Revolution.

Margaret Hutton and Edward Cook show how development occurred on the local level in middle Appalachia. Margaret Hutton, the largest slaveholder in Fayette County upon her death in the 1790s, shows how entrenched slavery was in the middle Appalachia by the Revolution. After the Revolution, it would grow within a political economy that promoted both slave and free labor. In the southern region of middle Appalachia, slavery began to grow, a trend that continued until the death of slavery during the Civil War. In northern middle Appalachia, slavery remained, albeit much more unstable than before the Revolutionary period, despite the instability of the region generally.

Moreover, the second wave settlers like Hutton and Cook show that capitalist market connections are beginning to solidify in the 1780s. The need for agricultural labor would not exist without these market connections. As Chapter 3 will show, both Baltimore and Philadelphia are competing for this economic hinterlands, especially when Baltimore begins the ascent to an important grain processing and commerce center. The second wave settlers are also facing issues that those before them faced and their agitation, particularly in the 1790s, is

expressive both of the capitalist market connections and the traditional issues such as infrastructure, currency, and the threat of Indians.

The instability of slavery in the region resulted from the passage of the 1780 gradual emancipation law in Pennsylvania. The interconnections that began in earnest in the 1780s was disrupted because of the law and the issue of fugitive slaves, a growing free black community, and slave kidnappings. The issues that the region faced because of this law would also affect other areas along the border but unlike in those regions, the issues could span the trans-Appalachian region; with the issues surrounding fugitives and kidnappings from the west and the east.

Chapter 3
"Almost on the fronteer": The Settlement, Development, and Incorporation of Middle Appalachia, 1770-1790

During and after the Revolution, the state governments of Maryland and Pennsylvania focused on development of their western lands, becoming deeply involved in creating a capitalist system that connected their western hinterlands to eastern markets. From encouragements of commodity productions to the construction of roads and bridges, westerners became the impetus for these creations. They demanded liberal monetary policies, defense from Indian attacks, and the creation of infrastructure and opening up of markets for their agricultural, and later industrial, goods.

These demanding westerners created a significant amount of political turmoil, as the people of middle Appalachia brought a much more insular politics to the state legislatures by emphasizing local control and a protection of the interests of their regions. This was especially true in the 1776 constitutional conventions of both states when debates over representation and voting rights split Pennsylvania and Maryland along east-west lines. Specific issues, such as the need for more hard cash, the desire for increased representation in state government, and the economic opportunities such as infrastructure and investment, all contributed to the split. In Pennsylvania, the split was organized almost entirely along east-west sectional lines; in Maryland, it was more complicated in that westerners were joined by the growing Baltimore metropole in the fight for increased representation. The insularity of the West was displayed not only politically, but socially, as this region saw an influx of settlers after the Revolution. The rising number of settlers, the incorporation into state and national politics, and the growth of capitalist connections ensured that the people of middle Appalachia remained politically, socially, and even religiously separate even while changes on the state and national levels forced

them to confront a new political and economic reality as middle Appalachia transitioned in the 1790s to full incorporation.

The key to the capitalist development of the West began in the efforts of the proto-state and then state legislatures to prepare to fight the Revolution, create new markets, and develop an infrastructure. Much as in the colonial period, however, the infrastructure and economic investments made for the purposes of furthering war goals expanded and changed the economy of the states. By 1790, the population of middle Appalachia was growing and that growth fueled its political and economic incorporation with the East—fueling some of the tensions between the regions.

Those political fissures can be vividly seen through the final versions of the Maryland and Pennsylvania state constitutions. Each of these states present a case study in state constitutional development, and when compared, show how different the revolutionary experience could be—even for states that share a border. Indeed, despite their proximity, Pennsylvania underwent the most radical constitutional and social changes in the revolutionary period, including the most radical state constitution that provided for a democratic government and widespread suffrage; Maryland's Revolution also altered the political and social landscape in that state, although the alterations were much more contested between conservative elements and radical elements in the state, evidenced by the more moderate state constitution adopted. Moreover, the legal changes in the state, particularly the increased representation for middle Appalachia in both states, ensured that the brand of politics practiced on the local level would both affect the state government and be affected by outside influences. While connections existed well before this period, the unique political alliances that formed in both states ensured that middle Appalachia would be thoroughly entrenched in state politics by 1790. The political

and capitalist connections made during and after the Revolution and into the 1780s were foundational and provided the social, economic, and political circumstances that transitioned middle Appalachia during the 1790s.

Through the Revolution and into the 1780s, middle Appalachia was socially insular. Isolated geographically and under consistent Indian attack since the beginning of the French and Indian War, middle Appalachians tended to distrust outside authorities. During the Revolution and into the 1780s, middle Appalachians also consistently felt ignored by state authorities, particularly the region that fell into or was claimed by Pennsylvania because colonial and state authorities either did not or were unable to respond to needs for infrastructure development, defense, and to provide hard currency for the region. The foundational period changed in large part because state governments became more involved in middle Appalachia and middle Appalachians became more involved in state and national politics as constitutional developed occurred at the state and national level.

In 1773, Parliament passed the Tea Act, designed to aid an ailing East India Company. Americans were afraid of an East India Company monopoly, fearing the results of such a monopoly upon their freedom, and began to protest. In many of the major port cities, also home to tea resellers who stood to lose enormously from the Tea Act, protests broke out. In Boston, this resulted in the destruction of large quantities of tea.[1]

Pennsylvanians and Marylanders were just as concerned about the Tea Act. Merchants in Pennsylvania, calmed by the lack of protest by the colonial assembly, contracted for a shipment of tea that promised enormous profits. The threat of monopoly, however, forced others to protest

[1] Benjamin L. Carp, *Defiance of the Patriots: The Boston Tea Party and the Making of America* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2010),122-126; Middlekauff, *The Glorious Cause*, 231-232.

the incoming shipment of tea, which they learned about in October 1773. A group of influential men in Philadelphia produced a list of resolutions, which included protests against Parliamentary taxation, an argument that the East India Company's need to "send out their tea to America, subject to the payment of duties on its being landed here, is an open attempt to enforce this ministerial plan, and a violent attack upon the liberties of America" and that it is the "duty of every American to oppose this attempt."[2]

In a town meeting held later that month, Philadelphians endorsed the protests against the Tea Act, a surprise for the unsuspecting Captain Ayres who captained the *Polly* that carried the tea shipment. When Ayres arrived in November, he was treated well but in December 1773, but was forced to stand before a crowd and swear that he would return to England immediately once he provisioned his ship. Colonial authorities, particularly the Penn family, was unable to respond quickly or do anything to stop this.[3]

The Coercive Acts passed by Parliament to punish Boston and provide an example to other colonies filtered throughout the colonies, Maryland became resistant to British control. The people of Annapolis, capital of Maryland and commercial center before and during the Revolution, resisted the Tea Act and protested the ministerial reforms. By October 1774, the *Peggy Stewart* arrived in Annapolis, carrying a shipment of tea that was ordered before the creation of an Association designed to stop trade with Britain. Unlike with the *Polly* in Philadelphia, the threat of mob violence forced the captain of the *Peggy Stewart* to burn his ship.

[2] Joseph Cummins, *Ten Tea Parties: Patriotic Protests That History Forgot* (Philadelphia: Quirk Books, 2012), 65-68.

[3] Ibid., 59-77.

He did so because the merchant who ordered the tea refused to send away the shipment and he was worried for his life.[4]

In response to the Coercive Acts, Americans organized the First Continental Congress in Philadelphia in September 1774. All colonies, save for Georgia, attended and its delegates took several conciliatory actions towards the British government. It adopted the "Declaration of Colonial Rights", which outlined colonial objections to the Coercive Acts. Importantly, it also called for the formation of a Continental Association to enforce a trade boycott with Britain. Finally, it called for a second congress to meet in 1775 should the situation not be resolved.[5]

The formation of the Continental Association, like that in Annapolis, had ramifications for the colonies beyond the enforcement of, what was in the end, an ineffective trade boycott. It allowed for the creation of what essentially became shadow governments across the colonies. The Continental Association, or Association, was designed to also "encourage frugality, economy, and industry, and promote agriculture, arts and the manufactures of this country, especially that of wool." While the exact structure of the Association depended on local conditions in each colony, a Committees of Safety, generally at the county or city level, oversaw the import/export ban and ensured that merchants were not price gouging. The committees of safety were designed specifically to seek "out some of the domestic" enemies by looking for people who avoided the nonimportation agreements, militia service, or dedicating enough to the Revolutionary cause. Most of these responsibilities would be taken on by the states in 1776 after most states created constitutions.[6]

---

[4] Ibid., 145-157.

[5] Middlekauff, *The Glorious Cause*, 239.

[6] Ibid., 253, 565; T. H. Breen, *American Insurgents, American Patriots* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2010), 160-164.

As T. H. Breen argues, local committees of safety "became schools for revolution."[7] The success of the Revolution could not have occurred without the actions of the First Continental Congress creating the associations and committees across the colonies because they were both the enforcers of anti-British actions and the people who kept the resistance alive. The associations and committees also allowed for the increase in political participation that swept the colonies in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. The transformation of political culture was felt at both the state and federal level, particularly in Pennsylvania, which had the most radical revolutionary state constitution and offered widespread suffrage and democratic government and contrasted with that established in Maryland.[8] Before these revolutionary constitutions were established, however, associations helped create conventions in almost every colony.

In late 1774, Maryland Patriots formed the Convention of the Province of Maryland, which became the governing body of Maryland during the early revolutionary years. The Maryland Convention did three things throughout its life from 1774 to 1776, when a new state constitution implemented a government not associated with royal government. First, it established local committees of safety throughout the colony to ensure not only the enforcement of the ban encouraged by the Continental Congress but also to help maintain law and order. Second, the Convention organized a new colonial militia and military system to "defend the rights of the province." Finally, they encouraged manufacturing in the colony, to aid the colony

[7] Breen, *American Insurgents, American Patriots*, 3.

[8] Ibid., 4, 12.

militarily and economically in a time when relying on imports was unpopular and shipments disrupted.[9]

The first measure the Convention took was one that had immediate, practical applications for Maryland- to increase the flocks of sheep, and thereby wool production, in the colony. They banned the butchering of young sheep under a certain age beginning in May 1775 and encouraged increased production of flax, hemp, and cotton in the colony, particularly in those "lands are best adapted to that purpose" which included the more settled eastern portions of the state but also into the increasingly populated western regions, including middle Appalachia. They also encouraged food production, encouraging the transition to grains already occurring in the Chesapeake from tobacco monoculture.[10] Just as importantly, and a tool commonly used throughout the colonies and England during times of scarcity, the legislature levied price controls on important goods such as food and clothes, particularly flour. The price controls set in 1774 applied to wholesale merchants and restricted the amount they could charge for goods in either cash or credit. These actions had a definite impact on western Maryland, which was the center of non-tobacco agricultural production in Maryland, particularly around Hagerstown and Frederickstown. [11]

The production of cloth must also be understood in the late colonial political economy of British North America. The eighteenth century was a consumer revolution in the colonies,

---

[9] *Proceedings of the Conventions of the Province of Maryland, 1774-1776* in the Archives of Maryland Online, http://aomol.msa.maryland.gov/megafile/msa/speccol/sc4800/sc4872/html/conventions.html (accessed April 17, 2017), 6-7; Brugger, *Maryland*, 120-123; Pauline Maier, *From Resistance to Revolution: Colonial Radicals and the Development of American Opposition* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1992), 77-78.

[10] *Proceedings of the Conventions of the Province of Maryland, 1774-1776*, 7; Berlin, *Generations of Captivity*, 113-114.

[11] *Proceedings of the Conventions of the Province of Maryland, 1774-1776*, 8-9.

stimulated by economic success and easy credit from Great Britain. The importation of cloth into the colony, which was an expression of success as much as economic necessity, became as controversial as tea in the 1760s and 1770s as tensions in the empire rose. Not only did the conspicuous consumption of imported cloth become both an economic and moral issue to many in the colonies, particularly the clergy, it also expressed the increasing indebtedness of the colonials within the British Empire and connection to the broader British Atlantic. Large planters, particularly in the Cheseapeake were joined by smaller planters and nonslaveholders in accruing a worrying amount of debt, along with style, in the colonial period. The emphasis placed by Maryland on cloth production, therefore, was a byproduct of the public discussions of consumption, debt, and morality beginning in the mid-eighteenth century.[12]

Moreover, the Convention called on counties to supply money to the convention government. Showing how important Frederick County was, of the ten thousand pounds requested by the Convention, over ten percent was requested from Frederick County, the county which covered middle Appalachia in Maryland in 1774, signifying the growing population of western Maryland. They also called for the creation of an association to maintain the economic strictures set forth in that year and to help govern the colony while the imperial troubles continued. This association was designed not only to help govern Maryland but also to develop contacts with other colonies and to join one, like Massachusetts, that would suffer punishment by Parliament.[13] Showing both the size and importance of Frederick County, it was assigned an association committee with fifty-three members. Those members were elected from three

[12] T. H. Breen, *The Marketplace of Revolution: How Consumer Politics Shaped American Independence* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 121-127, 158-166; Paul G. E. Clemens, "The Consumer Culture of the Middle Atlantic, 1760-1820" in *The William and Mary Quarter* Third Series 62, no. 4 (October 2005), 628.

[13] *Proceedings of the Conventions of the Province of Maryland, 1774-1776*, 10, 30.

districts, presaging the split in 1776 of Washington County from Frederick, and of Allegany County from Washington in 1789. As per the formal requirements of the colonial government, only freemen holding property worth forty pounds sterling, or "otherwise qualified to vote," could vote in these elections.[14]

Western Marylanders met the Association prescribed by the Convention with enthusiasm as most of them, due to the political controversies of the previous decade in the colony, supported the patriot cause, especially considering the fight between Governor Eden and the legislature during and after the French and Indian War. Therefore, they joined in resistance movements like the Association and argued that "the right of taxation [be] given up on permanent principles" and not for expediency while also keeping up the pressure for further development in western Maryland, which included both infrastructure, access to credit and currency, and industrial development.[15]

The beginning of the Revolution laid the foundation for the eventual creation of two western counties of Maryland that formed middle Appalachia in that state. In 1774, two different groups met in the county at Hagerstown and modern-day Frederick. The Hagerstown meeting represented the furthest settlements of Maryland at the time, including what would become Allegany County in 1789.[16] The establishment of two different organizations of groups in those towns shows both the extent of western settlement in Maryland and also its limits- despite the founding of Fort Cumberland, the region around it was still sparsely settled. By 1776, the two back districts petitioned for the creation of a new county and the legislature

[14] Ibid., 30.

[15] Bernard Christian Steiner, "Western Maryland in the Revolution", 6-7.

[16] Ibid., 8-9.

created Washington County, which contains modern day Washington, Allegany, and Garrett County. Residents cited, in their calls for further county creation, the need for local, responsive government, and the desire for further representation in the legislature.[17]

Frederick County became an important piece of one of the Convention's major goals: to prepare the colony for self-sufficiency, particularly in preparing for war. To do this, the Convention established procedures for the creation of powder mills and saltpeter works. The Convention appropriated seventeen hundred pounds, to be spread throughout the counties, for the creation of manufactories. They also established procedures by which supervisors, whom they describe as "discreet individuals", can create these manufactories, hire laborers, especially skillful craftsman, and set the pay for these workers.[18] In Frederick County, the Convention drafted a special procedure for the creation of a gunlock manufacturer there. Twelve hundred pounds and three commissioners were sent to Frederick County to establish a manufactory and to help procure gunlocks for the militia.[19]

The people of western Maryland, primarily those settling in and around the towns, at the Hagerstown meeting agreed with the Convention's measures, believing that "adhere to any measure that may be adopted by them for the preservation of our liberties" and that the "surest means for continuing a people free and happy is the disusing all luxuries and depending only on their own fields and flocks for the comfortable necessities of life." In so doing, they followed the recommendation of the Convention to not slaughter sheep, manufacturing necessities of life

[17] Ibid., 18. This is also true in southwestern Pennsylvania; residents there are distrustful of the legislature and wish for more representation (along with more democratic means of elections). See Robert L. Brunhouse, *The Counter-Revolution in Pennsylvania, 1776-1790* and Russell J. Ferguson, *Early Western Pennsylvania Politics* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1938).

[18] *Proceedings of the Conventions of the Province of Maryland, 1774-1776*., 58-60.

[19] Ibid., 62.

for domestic and military use, and, in tune with the day, burn an effigy of Lord North.[20] The people who swore to follow Convention guidelines and took part in Revolutionary activities hoped to secure and expand the power that they gained in the new revolutionary councils including more representation in the Maryland government. The elites and growing middle class also stood to benefit from the economic investments, infrastructure and market connections east and across colonial boundaries that was consistently part of the western agenda.[21]

The investment in the armaments industry in western Maryland focused primarily around Frederickstown because it was both inland and relatively safe from British forces. It operated as a prisoner holding center, supply center, and munitions production center. Two important ironworks in the region provided the resources available for this new heavy industry in western Maryland. Patriot forces produced canons produced at the Catoctin Iron Furnace in Frederick County and the Antietam Ironworks in Washington County. Enough munitions were produced in Frederick and Washington counties that they were able to supply troops from both Maryland and Virginia. [22]

Local businessmen, capitalizing on the Convention's interest in Fredericktown as a good site for a manufactory, worked hard to secure funding from the group to continue to spur development. Fielder Gaunt sent word in early 1775 that he discovered a vein of lead ore in Frederick County near the Kitocton Mountain and requested two hundred pounds from the Convention to exploit his find. Upon finding a second vein, the Convention agreed to help fund his mining operation because the lead from that mine "would be of great advantage to the

[20] Steiner, "Western Maryland in the Revolution," 9.

[21] These concerns are couched in the language of the petitions and writings of people at the time. For an example, see Thomas J. Scharf, *History of Western Maryland*.

[22] Ibid., 45.

public."[23] Likewise, a second resident of Fredericktown, Alexander McFadon, petitioned for help in creating a linen, woolen, and cotton manufactory near Fredericktown. He requested the convention advance him five hundred pounds so that he could get the raw materials and carry "on the same so extensively, as thereby to manufacture fifty thousand yards", with a promise to procure for the colony all that he could although he could not promise the prices for that procurement.[24]

Gaunt's application for support to develop a vein of lead ore is representative of a trend after the Revolution when extractive industries in both ores and coal and associated processing industries grow in middle Appalachia. The investment in extractive industries, the construction of infrastructure, and the settlement of middle Appalachia which began during the Revolution creates a transitional period in the 1790s, when settlement increases drastically and the second-wave settlers begin constructing capitalist market connections both inside middle Appalachia and within national marketplaces. Moreover, a trend which began during the colonial period will intensify with the end of the Revolution and create a system of investment and exploitation that shaped the economy of middle Appalachia into the nineteenth century.[25]

The Convention was especially enamored with the possibilities of linen and woolen manufacturers because of the colony's pervasive poverty. The committee that dealt with these petitions for manufactory requested because "a number of poor people may be employed, fed,

[23] *Proceedings of the Conventions of the Province of Maryland, 1774-1776.,* 69.

[24] Ibid., 70.

[25] For evidence of this, see investment schemes like George Washington's attempt to establish estates or Margaret Hoe's decision, along with her family, to move into Pennsylvania Middle Appalachia. These movements are part of a broader understanding, particularly among those with wealth who can purchase large amounts of land and bring labor, that middle Appalachia is both an investment and a settlement opportunity. See Wilma Dunaway's *The First American Frontier*, for an accounting of these investors.

and clothed thereby". It led the committee to request that five thousand pounds be made available to the counties, of which five hundred allocated to Frederick County, for the creation of these manufactories. Loans would be given, contractors would be sent, and the Convention would accomplish two goals: the production of valuable material for the war and to get jobs for those who needed them and who otherwise had to rely upon government and private charity.[26]

The use and understanding of the poor in colonial and Revolutionary were based on understandings of social control, economic utility, and class. The poor represented an opportune labor source, particularly where children and orphans were involved. "Poor houses," established by most counties, were oftentimes houses for labor that could be auctioned and sold, despite their skin color. Whites who were consistently poor, had trouble maintaining work, or had legal trouble, along with their children, were oftentimes forced to rely upon poor houses for support. When they did so, county officials could and often did hire them out as laborers to those considered "needy" like the aged; or to members of the communities that were economically stable, like artisans and farmers. For African Americans, the road to being auctioned off was much shorter as free blacks were seen as undesirable by most communities in both Maryland and Pennsylvania and thus were liable to be auctioned off in the same way. Although not classified as slaves, those caught in this system often had little opportunity to defy it.[27]

These efforts by the Convention faced many difficulties that were felt throughout the colonies: lack of finances, inability to procure the goods, and overpromises by those who claimed to set up the manufactories. McFadon was given three hundred pounds to establish his manufactory in Georgetown, Frederick County, at the same time that Robert Wood received

[26] *Proceedings of the Conventions of the Province of Maryland, 1774-1776*, 71.

[27] Dunaway, *The First American Frontier*, 112-113.

funds to construct a textile manufactory in Fredericktown. The role McFaden, Wood, and men like him played is important, as Fredericktown was quickly becoming the center of grain processing and manufacturing in the western portion of the colony. Thus, the plans of the convention in to both alleviate poverty and procure war materials was difficult and serious industrial development, with the exception of places like Antietam, did not occur until the conclusion of the Revolution. The failure or success of these projects shows, however, that the economic elite were looking for development and opportunities to create capitalist market connections that supported development.[28]

The eighteenth century saw grain and flour production steadily increase in western Maryland, precipitating Baltimore as a center of flour milling and shipping during the early national period. The increasing importance of the grain and flour trade stimulated infrastructure development, beginning around the middle of the eighteenth century, which made Frederickstown a center of milling in western Maryland.[29] Indeed, by the end of the eighteenth century, Frederick's economy was both diverse and growing. Frederickstown especially prospered in large part because of diversified agriculture, small-scale manufacturing, and the market connections to both domestic and foreign sources.[30]

Beginning in the 1730s, colonial efforts at constructing roads that connected western settlement occurred. This was a period in which western Maryland was undergoing settlement

[28] *Proceedings of the Conventions of the Province of Maryland, 1774-1776*, 158-159; 195.

[29] John F. Kvach,"Wheat, Wealth, and Western Maryland: The Growth and Evolution of Flour Milling in Frederick County, Maryland, 1748-1789," 2-3; Brooke Hunter, "Wheat, War, and the American Economy during the Age of Revolution" in *The William and Mary Quarterly* 62, no. 3 "The Atlantic Economy in the Era of Revolutions (July 2005), 508-509.

[30] Elizabeth August Kessel, "Germans on the Maryland Frontier: A Social History of Frederick County, Maryland, 1730-1800, Volume 1" (PhD diss., Rice University, 1981), 110.

from both east and north; heavily German in nature, it was also an area where slavery did not take root early on. By the 1750s, the colonial government, at the urging of county governments, was forced to straighten and repair roads, a process that was repeated in the 1770s by the Revolutionary government and again in the 1780s. The desire and requests for straighter roads that linked middle Appalachia to the east consistently remained a high priority for settlers in the region—they wanted access to markets and roads, until the nineteenth century, remained the only consistent way to for connections to exist to eastern markets. Connections were important to colonial commercial centers like Annapolis, where overproduce was sold. However, the growth of Baltimore as a commercial center represented further opportunities, and indeed, a sort of political alliance formed between westerners and Baltimore that helped to forge not just political but also economic connections.[31]

The development of Frederick, and indeed of all of middle Appalachia to the west, shows that local primary source production often combined with processing of those goods, whether flour, leather, or other processed goods. The role of towns in this production is important, particularly as what will become Allegany County is settled in the 1780s further.[32] Thus, when the Convention said that Frederick County and western Maryland should receive "especial encouragement…to country manufactures."[33] This was especially important with the disruption of foreign trade that began in earnest during the Revolution, forcing the colonies to

[31] Scharf, *History of Western Maryland*, 436-438.

[32] Dunaway, *The First American Frontier, esp. Chapter 7*.

[33] *Proceedings of the Conventions of the Province of Maryland, 1774-1776*, 163 as quoted in Steiner, "Western Maryland in the Revolution," 47.

invest in native industries such as munitions, which then stimulated the production of iron and steel along with other necessities like textiles and shoes.[34]

The Convention's final months saw support for more connections in western Maryland by the creation of a new state constitution and the further development of political and economic connections. Picking up from the colonial government's active interest in the construction of roads, ferries, and bridges that opened access from the west to the east, these economic connections ensured that economic ties continued to grow in the state and the legislators hoped to ensure that western Maryland's economic production flow to Baltimore and not into Philadelphia. The connections made to Frederickstown and Hagerstown were important to this end, as were the establishment of counties in western Maryland that better responded to the needs of the people settled there (emphasizing, as always, the economic and political elite of the region). Thus, these connections grew at the same time as a new state government came to power.[35]

One of the last issues before the convention was dealing head on with east-west tensions in Maryland that were holdovers from the colonial period and continued into the nineteenth century. T. Wright offered an amendment to the Declaration of Rights that began the new Maryland state constitution which state "that if the eastern or western shore shall hereafter judge it for their interest and happiness to separate from the other, their right to do so is hereby acknowledged." Another member of the Convention offered that it can only happen if "a majority of qualified voters in elections in every county" on both sides agreed to it.[36]

---

[34] John J. McCusker and Russell R. Menard, *The Economy of British America, 1607-1789* (Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 2006), 363.

[35] *Proceedings of the Conventions of the Province of Maryland, 1774-1776*, 194.

[36] Ibid., 310.

The motion is important, despite its failure to pass, because Maryland, Virginia, and Pennsylvania were jostling for western territory. In October 1776, the Virginia legislature issued a claim in their constitution which caused an uproar in the Maryland Convention—they claimed the land given to it in the 1609 charter and therefore declared all land which was ceded by the French to Great Britain after the French and Indian War. It also called for the creation of governments "westward of the Alleghany mountains." This territory fell within the region that was contested between Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Maryland, with the primary contestants Pennsylvania and Virginia.

In response, the Maryland convention passed a resolution which reaffirmed their claim to the territories in the original charter granted to Calvert. By declaring that Virginia's claim has no "foundation in justice" and that if such a claim is upheld, then the "freedom of the smaller states and the liberty of America" was in danger. This argument between Maryland and Virginia is common of the period; other colonies fought with one another over the vast western territories with competing claims. That there was discussion of a split between the eastern and western shore of Maryland and that it did not go further than a failed resolution shows that economic and political interests were intertwined in Maryland enough that westerners saw advantage in maintaining the integrity of the state.[37]

The issues surrounding the border between Maryland, Virginia, and Pennsylvania were settled with the establishment of the Mason-Dixon Line in 1780. Due to the way that southwestern Pennsylvania (that state's section of middle Appalachia) was settled, the region was settled not only from Pennsylvania, but also south from Maryland and Virginia.[38] With the

[37] Ibid., 292-93. The ramifications for slavery and slaveholding were discussed in Chapter 2.

[38] John E. Potter, "The Pennsylvania and Virginia Boundary Controversy." *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 38, no. 4 (1914), 407.

opening of Braddock's Road that linked Virginia with Pittsburgh, settlement continued in the valleys and along the rivers of middle Appalachia. These settlers brought unfree labor with the cultural expectation of a slave society that long existed in Virginia.[39]

Many of these unfree laborers that followed these roads settled, along with their owners, in southwestern Pennsylvania despite the passage of the 1780 law.[40] These second-wave settlers were also Revolutionary War veterans (men like Edward Cook, for instance) who were promised land in the west by Pennsylvania and Virginia (even Maryland joined in to promise land-for that state, it was west of the growing settlement of Cumberland). One example of how complicated land claims by the states could be was *Sims Lessee vs. Irvine*, a Supreme Court case decided in 1799, about land grants given to Revolutionary war veterans. William Irvine was granted an island in the Ohio River for his service by Pennsylvania after the conclusion of the war and Charles Simms the same area by Virginia. The Court decided in favor of Simms due to a prior claim but this case shows how difficult cases over western land could be decades after the fact.[41] Thus, issues over western land continued into the early Republic period and were cross-border issues.

At the same time that Maryland created laws to build an economy for war and to connect east and west, Pennsylvania Patriots attempted the same. Due to the nature of Pennsylvania's western frontier, the assembly was forced to not only deal with economic and military concerns, along with keeping a fractious assembly together, but also a relatively new issue, frontier

---

[39] See Chapter 2 for details of unfree labor in southwestern Pennsylvania.

[40] Potter, "The Pennsylvania and Virginia Boundary Controversy", 420.

[41] Ibid., 420; *Sims v. Irvine* 3 U.S. 425 (1799), accessed from https://casetext.com/case/sims-v-irvine (accessed October 7, 2017).

defense, without the aid of British forces. For western Pennsylvanians, this became a particularly important issue since because the French and Indian War never entirely ended.

The government took action to defend the newly formed state against western attack, although these actions were largely ineffective because the war in the east in 1776 and 1777 was turning against the Americans. The government's attention in the west was focused on British forts there because the Indians were "instigated by the commandant of the British garrison of Fort Detroit and other British agents and emissaries," had caused a number of "helpless people (to) have been cruelly massacred." Pennsylvanian's action in mobilizing the western militia in Bedford and Westmoreland counties to fight off Indian and British attacks helped to create overtures by the Pennsylvania government to westerners and establish defense, although since these actions were largely ineffective, western complaints continued. While defense of the west was important in Pennsylvania, particularly considering the struggle over authority there with Virginia centering on Pittsburgh, the assembly was also taking many of the measures taken previously by the Maryland Convention that would help defend the frontier, including the creation of militia units and asking for aid from the Continental Congress, but also in building economic connections with western Pennsylvania. [42]

Thus, the role of middle Appalachia in the Revolution was slight but it would grow beginning in the 1780s after inpendence. Since it was only the eastern fringes of middle Appalachia that were settled at this point, the role they played were slight. The role of the colonial and state governments in developing these regions, however, was not. The role of

[42] *The Statutes at Large of Pennsylvania from 1682-1801 Compiled under the authority of the act of May 19, 1887 by James T. Mitchell and Henry Flanders, commissioners* Volume 9 (Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, 1896-1909), 159-161.

government in investment in and expansion of economic development was critical to the eventual settlement in middle Appalachia.

The Pennsylvania revolutionary constitution, the structure, radicalism, and social forces that it resisted, unleashed, and represented, created reactions in middle Appalachia that were informed by the continued Indian attacks while also instilled with some suspicion about the motives of eastern elites and political rivals. Importantly, however, as Gordon Wood argues, "what happened in Pennsylvania was only an extension of what was taking place elsewhere in America."[43] Pennsylvania worked after the Declaration of Independence to create a new state constitution, which was ratified in September 1776, Maryland followed in November.[44]

The Pennsylvania revolutionary constitution was the most democratic and radical of any adopted by the states. It allowed for any white taxpaying male who pledged loyalty to the state government to vote (disfranchising some groups, like the Quakers, who foreswore oath swearing) and serve in the government. Annual elections of the legislature, a weak executive branch (itself a committee), and a requirement that before laws of a "public nature" may be enacted that they "shall be printed for the consideration of the people" and did not go into effect until the next legislature met unless "sudden necessity" required it.[45]

However, the radical nature of the constitution nor the problems of a government, which disfranchised parts of the Pennsylvania electorate that did not swear loyalty to the state, were lost on westerners. The inflammation of the border dispute between Pennsylvania and Virginia, the attempts by British troops to maintain the Proclamation Line, and the agitation of easterners

---

[43] Gordon S. Wood, *The Creation of the American Republic, 1776-1787* (Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 1998), 85.

[44] Ibid., 133.

[45] *The Proceedings Relative to Calling the Conventions of 1776 and 1790…*, 59.

(particularly in Massachusetts) inflamed anti-British sentiment in western Pennsylvania. Except for the region immediately around Pittsburgh, where until the 1770s the British had troops stationed and thus had need for the goods of the region and the money to pay for it, patriot sentiments were high.[46] The patriot sentiments shaped the political culture of middle Appalachia in numerous ways, particularly as the states fought for authority over middle Appalachia. Once the threat of British or Indian attacks subsided, the states began to argue over possession of the land, particularly when it came to land grants to veterans of the war. Most importantly, for the last two decades of the eighteenth century, it ensured that the fight by Virginians for land titles and this call was answered with the creation of Washington County in 1781 and Fayette County in 1783.[47] These two counties (especially Fayette) had a much higher concentration of slaves than any other except for Allegany County (home of Pittsburg) in middle Appalachia north of the Mason-Dixon Line.

Westerners initially supported the call for a new constitution as they were attracted by the notion of (relatively) equal representation for westerners in the new legislature. Combined with the desire for more influence in state politics, westerners were motivated to switch any allegiance they had for the old colonial government to the new constitutional convention by for a promise of representation and defense. It should be noted that, depending on location, the motivations for different towns, counties, and individuals changed. For instance, in Bedford County, which was more insulated from Indian attacks, there was more interest in securing power in state politics; in Westmoreland County (which included the future Fayette County), defense from Indian attacks was still a significant motivation (particularly with their proximity to Pittsburgh). Finally, these

[46] Ferguson, *Early Western Pennsylvanian Politics*, 21.

[47] Ibid., 22.

issues are not exclusive- concern about Indian attacks was often side-by-side with concern over power in state government for westerners (along with traditional economic issues like the lack of hard currency in the west).[48]

Eight members were elected to the constitutional convention. The men who represented western Pennsylvania were those from the upper echelons of society: business owners, Indian fighters, landowners, and government officials.[49] Of ninety-six delegates, twenty-three did not sign the constitution. Five of those who refused were from the west. The resistance from these five westerners stemmed from the lack of resources sent west and the consistent complaints by westerners: infrastructure, hard cash, and defense.[50] Indeed there was not a year between 1774 and 1783 in which the counties of western Pennsylvania did not send a petition to the executive council in Pennsylvania for relief and additional resources to fight the war in the east. Because of the war in the east, the problems facing the west were generally either left unaddressed, or when resources were dedicated, they were not enough. The response to these addresses was inadequate, which underscored the consistent resistance among westerners to the new state government. Moreover, the continued border disputes with Virginia created a situation that "smacked of sectionalism," as one historian has argued.[51]

[48] For more on westerners' discontent during and after the Revolution, see Blessing, "The Upper Juniata Valley"; Brunhouse, *The Counter Revolution in Pennsylvania*; Ferguson, *Early Western Pennsylvania Politics.* The frontier conditions of middle Appalachia insured that agitation would continue for the rest of the eighteenth century in the region.

[49] Ferguson, *Early Western Pennsylvania Politics*, 28-30.

[50] Ibid., 31.

[51] Ibid., 32.

As Daniel Barr argued, the contest for this region was primarily one of a "struggle for authority."[52] It was a "contentious space" in which the "competition for land, unrelenting warfare, and a struggle for power" impacted the life of settlers.[53] As such, any expression of authority from eastern authorities, Virginian or Pennsylvanian, were greeted with welcome and skepticism, depending on the loyalties of the person. The fight over authority and the influence of Virginia was felt with the gradual emancipation law of 1780. The act passed by a vote of thirty-four to twenty-one and most of the westerners opposed.[54]

As in many of the colonies, revolutionary leaders in Maryland hoped to minimize the social and political changes of the people. Members of the state constitutional convention were elected following the traditional election laws of Maryland. Requiring at least forty pounds of visible estate ensured that many men could not vote, much less run, for election. Surprisingly for many, and encouraging for those who wished for reform, there were a number of those who did not identify as planters, but rather as farmers, physicians, manufacturers, and merchants. For many, the promise of reform was stimulated both by the revolutionary rhetoric of the period but also by the example of the Pennsylvania constitution. There were arguments in newspapers such as the *Maryland Gazette* which argued that those who served in the colonial militia or otherwise lent "aid to the support of" the state should receive suffrage.[55]

The Maryland state constitution was a relatively conservative one (especially when compared with Pennsylvania) as it left in place property requirements for office holding and

---

[52] Barr, *A Colony Sprung from Hell*, 18.

[53] Ibid., 5.

[54] Ferguson, *Early Western Pennsylvania Politics*, 34.

[55] Brugger, *Maryland*, 121; Skaggs, *Roots of Maryland Democracy*, 186.

allowed non-property holders to vote only for the state legislature. Further, an electoral college made up of men who owned five hundred pounds of property elected the senate every five years and provided for higher numbers of representatives for the Western Shore counties based on their higher population, but only just. This representation scheme shows the enduring power of the large tobacco planters of Maryland. Baltimore, a fast-growing city during this time, was slighted in representation- a trend that would continue well into the nineteenth century.[56]

One provision did allow for an increase in the number of voters in Maryland. According to the new constitution, those who held forty pounds in property or thirty pounds in "current money" could vote, which did expand the franchise, particularly in the western portion of the state. The issue would not be serious during the Revolution, as the currency devalued, but would in the nineteenth century as the requirement stopped some, particularly in urban areas, from voting. In Washington County, which covered western Maryland including middle Appalachia, it increased the franchise by twenty percent. Moreover, by the time the state government began forming in earnest in 1777, there were many who had not previously occupied government offices entering politics.[57]

There were two factions in the convention that represented the east-west split in Maryland: "democratic" and "whiggish". The "democrats" came mostly from Baltimore and the western counties, mimicking the relationship formed in the colonial period. This was the side which contained members from "more recently settled "regions who had "accumulated less wealth and far few slaves" and generally practiced diversified agriculture with fewer plantations.

[56] Brugger, *Maryland*, 121-22; McSherry, *History of Maryland*, 218.

[57] Brugger, *Maryland*, 122-23.

These "democrats" were the minority in the constitutional convention.[58] The Maryland constitution represents the more conservative, "whiggish" tendencies of the state but it also illustrates the challenges facing the conservatives and the various regions; a tendency that forced amendments to the constitution in the nineteenth that expanded the franchise for white men while excluding black men.[59]

There was a desire, particularly among the older, densely settled, and higher slave counties to retain power despite the democratic forces unleased by the revolutionary period. The growing importance of both Annapolis and Baltimore, along with the growing economic and demographic strength of western Maryland, challenged this older power structure. The power of the conservative elements shows through in various ways, however, and will only gradually be diminished. Conservativism remained in many parts of the Maryland government; including elements of the Maryland Declaration of Rights, such as not protecting black newcomers in the states from being enslaved (voted down by the convention) and the retention of land requirements for voting.[60]

Two last important notes about the Maryland constitution which deals with the development of slavery and race in the state: no mention of slavery and the right to vote is not race-based. First, that there is no mention of slavery or the slave trade in the either the

[58] Skaggs, *Roots*, 187-88.

[59] The evolution of Maryland constitutional development is explored in detail in Brugger, *Maryland, A Middle Temperament* and Skaggs, *Roots of Maryland Democracy*. For an understanding of Pennslyvania and broader national changes, see also Jackson Turner Main, "Government by the people: the American Revolution and the democratization of the legislature," *William and Mary Quarterly* 23, no. 3 (July 1966), 391-406; Richard Alan Ryerson, "Republican Theory and Partisan Reality in Revolutionary Pennsylvania: Toward a New View of the Constitutionalist Party," *Sovereign States in an Age of Uncertainty*, edited by Ronald Hoffman and Peter J. Albert (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1981), 95-133; Gordon S. Wood, *The Creation of the American Republic*.

[60] Brugger, *Maryland, A Middle Temperament*, 122-23;

constitution or the Declaration of Rights (which precedes the constitution). Much like many other states, and for those who drafted the United States Constitution, the reason for this is obvious: talking about slavery in such an official place as the fundamental law of the state would present dramatic image problems for a people attempting to throw off the yoke of British slavery. Second, the right to vote with the original constitution is not restricted based on race, only property, age, gender, residency, and free status. This means that African Americans who met these requirements were able to vote. This would change in 1801 when the expansion of the franchise became based on race, blacks were disfranchised, and the franchise was expanded to include all white men, a trend seen throughout the states through the early republic and antebellum period.[61]

The Revolution did change American political culture as more Americans voted and participated in politics than before and this showed with the state legislatures. During the Confederation period, the state legislatures became the true center of powers in the colonies. The seemingly chaotic nature of the state legislatures troubled most Americans but for different reasons. For some, it was because tradition was threatened by rising new politicians and the middle class, for others, it was the lack of response to the economic troubles of the period, the high taxes, the inability of states to help with the money supply and the relief of debtors. The problems were numerous, and the states consistently tried to find new or refurbish old ways to fix the problems. For those in middle Appalachia, the problems were not that different than others across the country during the Revolution as they desired protection from Indian attacks, which were still ongoing into the 1780s although lessening, better transportation, easier credit

[61] Charles A. Rees, "Remarkable Evolution: The Early Constitutional History of Maryland" *University of Baltimore Law Review* 36, no. 2 (2007), 241, 255.

and money, and for their government to more equitably represent them. This macro-solution was the Constitution developed in Philadelphia in 1787.[62]

The state legislatures, the economic problems, and, perhaps the most compelling impetus, Shays' Rebellion in Massachusetts, all led to the Constitutional Convention. Both Maryland and Pennsylvania sent delegates to the convention. The arguments and compromises of the Constitutional Convention are important but more importantly, for this study, is what kind of government and nation that the Constitution created. By placing western lands under federal control and providing numerous and strong protections on private property, the Constitution provided for an aggressive republic which was inherently capitalistic in nature.[63]

The Constitution stipulated that each state create a convention to consider ratification and that once nine of thirteen states ratify, the constitution would go into effect. Pennsylvania was a critical state in the ratification efforts for a variety of reasons but most importantly it was large and it was the first to take up ratification. Western Pennsylvanian delegates to the state assembly were decidedly anti-ratification. Veterans of the political fights over the state constitution and supporters of the 1776 Pennsylvania constitution, they were generally upcoming men socially and economically and were concerned about the power of western Pennsylvania in future state politics.[64] They understood the new federal constitution through the lens of state battles and

[62] There has been extensive work done on the arguments for the constitutional convention and resulting document. For an overview, see Wood, *Empire of Liberty*, Wood, *The Creation of the American Republic*, Stanley Elkins and Eric McKitrick, *The Age of Federalism: The Early American Republic, 1788-1800* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993); Cornell, *The Other Founders*.

[63] The Constitution provided for expanding capitalist market relations not just by assuming ownership of western land and subsequent sales but also because it explicitly protected property rights, Allan Kulikoff, *The Agrarian Origins of American Capitalism* (Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia, 1992), 43-47.

[64] Pauline Maier, *Ratification: The People Debate the Constitution, 1787-1788* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2011), 98-99.

shared many of the anti-Federalist concerns over states' rights, local control, and representation; issues that they easily understood after their own battles over the state constitution throughout the 1780s. Pennsylvania did not become the first state to ratify the Constitution, despite the wishes of local Federalists, but it did eventually ratify over the protests of westerners. Thus, many of the issues regarding Pennsylvanian constitutional development affected the battle lines of the federal constitution in Pennsylvania.[65]

The debate over ratification in Pennsylvania was a difficult one and, while eventual ratification did come, it came at a political cost for the Federalists. Unlike in Pennsylvania, however, ratification in Maryland was relatively easily; there was very little anti-Federalist resistance in the convention. While some objections were raised by a minority antifederalist faction, there was no serious opposition to "unconditional ratification". In large part, western Marylanders, whose region was more densely settled than in Pennsylvania, were content with a stronger national government that "could defend and control its expanding domain, protect Maryland's booming sale of wheat at home and abroad, and end the tumultuous conflicts over paper money that had recently wracked Maryland as well as other states. The equal representation in the Senate" was also appealing to Maryland, which compared to its neighbors was very small indeed.[66]

The new federal constitution presented an opportunity for middle Appalachians though their opinion of it was divided. Those close to Pittsburgh, for instance, understood that a stronger federal government could ensure free navigation of the Mississippi River; a goal that was met in 1795 with the successful negotiations that resulted in Pinckney's Treaty, which

[65] Ibid., 99-100, 121; See also Saul Cornell, *The Other Founders*.

[66] Maier, *Ratification*, 246.

opened the Mississippi River to American commerce.[67] The national government also, at least in theory, would deal with the issues resulting from settlement in the West. The Confederation government attempted, with several land ordinances, to organize western lands and their settlement but with little luck.[68] Unfortunately, this is untrue but what the federal government did do in the 1790s was create a transitional period in middle Appalachia by opening the west to settlement and prosecuting Indian wars that helped to open up more land and many of the settlers moving northwest went through middle Appalachia.[69]

The heating up of state politics during the 1770s and 1780s, along with the intervention of the state governments in the state and local economy, had a direct impact upon the people of middle Appalachia. It was during the 1780s and 1790s that middle Appalachia underwent significant social, economic, and political development. Therefore, the fights over state constitutions, constitutional ratification, and the role of the state in economic development are of great interest to middle Appalachians.

Middle Appalahicians were active in creating the foundations of economic, political, and social life in the region in the 1770s and 1780s. Despite the threat of Indian attacks, the seeming ignorance of their state governments in the east, and the frontier conditions of life, they moved as quickly as possible to develop economic and social institutions, including the construction of mills and churches, the clearing of farmland, and the growth of settlements in the west (outside of Pittsburgh in western Pennsylvania).

---

[67] James Roger Sharp, *American Politics in the Early Republic: The New Nation in Crisis* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1993), 105, 109.

[68] Merrill Jensen, *New Nation: A History of the United States during the Confederation, 1781-1789* (New York: Random House, Inc., 1966), 350-355.

[69] Wood, *Empire of Liberty: A History of the Early Republic, 1789-1815* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 129.

Robert Ayres was an itinerant Methodist and Episcopalian minister who traveled throughout middle Appalachia in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century. During his travels, he preached to large and small congregations, made observations about the terrain and people, and commented upon the major issues of the day. In 1785-6, Ayres traveled throughout the eastern shore of Maryland, with occasional visits to Delaware, and preached to mixed-race congregations and even, once, to an all-black congregation. He was reassigned to the Redstone Circuit in southwestern Pennsylvania in 1786-7, a circuit which included much of middle Appalachia.[70]

Ayres set out on his first itinerant mission in 1786 through middle Appalachia, beginning in Fayette County, near Uniontown, and travelled south into Maryland near Cumberland in Allegany County, west into western Virginia, then turned north towards Pittsburgh and from there traveled east towards Fayette once again. He observed that settlement in middle Appalachia occurred despite, not because of, the region's geography. Just as importantly, everywhere he went along his circuit, he spoke to groups of people on most days, some as few as ten people while others could number in the several dozens. Therefore, by the late 1780s, middle Appalachia had become lightly settled in most places but it was really around towns like Cumberland and Uniontown that settlement was densest. Moreover, most of the settlers, like during the mid-eighteenth century, largely settled along the rivers and creeks that ran between the ridges of the region, like the Redstone Creek in Fayette County (Uniontown) and the North Branch of the Potomac.[71]

---

[70] Journal of Robert Ayres, 1785-1787. Box 1, Folder 3, The Paper of Robert Ayres 1785-1837, *Senator John Heinz History Center Library and Archives*.

[71] The Papers of Robert Ayres, Box 1, Folder 3; Total Population, 1790. Social Explorer https://www.socialexplorer.com/a9676d974c/explore (based on data from U.S. Census Bureau).

During the 1780s, Fort Cumberland, a "Little Town" was a growing settlement near a "now Demolish'd" fort "built In the Time of the last Indian War". Cumberland, Maryland, (it would later drop the "Fort" appellation) was still a relatively small settlement in the 1780s, with few residents and was the focus of settlement mainly of Revolutionary-era land grants given by the Maryland legislature to Revolutionary veterans. This caused a sizeable population increase, growing the region by twenty-eight percent during the last decade of the eighteenth century. As the population grew, settlements became economic nexuses around which the local agricultural and industrial economies grew. Moreover, they became transportation hubs, allowing both goods and people to move through the region, particularly as more transportation infrastructure was constructed.[72]

The roads, to Ayres, were "some of the worst I've seen" and only occasionally he would find a "good Road." Roads were critical during the foundation period as waterways were either closed off (such as the Ohio River and Mississippi River, which during the 1780s was closed to American traffic by the Spanish) or they were unreliable, like the North Fork of the Potomac River (although it was used with increasing frequency as settlement grew). The good roads that Ayres refers to are most likely those that are most established, like Braddock's Road, which goes from south to north. In the 1790s, when business like the Alliance Iron Works were constructed in middle Appalachia, these roads proved immensely useful as a means of travel and trade; the

[72] Total Population, 1790. Social Explorer https://www.socialexplorer.com/a9676d974c/explore (based on data from U.S. Census Bureau), Total Population, 1800. Social Explorer https://www.socialexplorer.com/a9676d974c/explore (based on data from U.S. Census Bureau). The twenty-eight percent figure comes from the existing counties in both the 1790 and 1800 census in Pennsylvania and Maryland along the border. These counties are Washington and Allegany in Maryland and Fayette in Pennsylvania.
Dunaway, *The First American Frontier*, 198.

need for resources that were locally extracted and information from outside the region utilized these roads.[73]

State politicians stymied the efforts for internal improvements in middle Appalachia, and more broadly in both Pennsylvania and Maryland. Both Philadelphia and Baltimore merchants wished to capture the hinterland economy of the region (particularly the eastern parts of middle Appalachia, the western portions connected with waterways like the Monongahela River were already feeding into Pittsburgh's regional economy). The inability of either state to figure out an internal improvements project that was comprehensive and not responsive, either roads or waterways, ensured that any attempts at internal improvements would be slowed and uncoordinated between the states. Moreover, the political insularity that developed after this period also dictated how internal improvements developed in this region.[74]

The most obvious interstate road system that existed in middle Appalachia, Braddock's Road, was carved out in part by the Ohio Company following Indian trails that linked Virginia through Maryland to southwestern Pennsylvania. Used by General Edward Braddock during the French and Indian War, this road was a path for settlers in western Maryland and Pennsylvania and is one reason why there were slaveholders in southwestern Pennsylvania throughout the eighteenth century and eventually became a major avenue of the Underground Railroad in the nineteenth century.[75] Forbes' Road also connected Middle Appalachia specifically eastern and

[73] Journal of Robert Ayres. Box 1, Folder 3, The Paper of Robert Ayres 1785-1837. This will be further covered in chapter 4.

[74] John Lauritz Larson, *Internal Improvements: National Public Works and the Promise of Popular Government* (Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 2001), 88-89; Barr, *A Colony Sprung from Hell*.

[75] Thomas J. Scharf, *History of Western Maryland: Being a History of Frederick, Montgomery, Carroll, Washington, Allegany, and Garrett Counties from the Earliest Period to the Present Day, Volume II* (Philadelphia: Louis H. Everts, 1882), 1327.

western Pennsylvania as it was carved to help advance the front against Fort Duquesne during the French and Indian War. Therefore, from both south and east, middle Appalachia became a borderlands of military conflicts. Just as importantly, the Maryland legislature worked to open up western settlement by creating a road from Fredericktown and Fort Cumberland, because they desired an easier means to get into western Maryland. According to a report offered to the legislature on the efficacy of constructing this road, not only would it "contribute much to lessen the expense of carrying provisions and warlike stores from Fort Frederick to Fort Cumberland" it would also help to "induce many people to travel and carry on a trade in and through the province, to and from the backcountry."[76]

The roads constructed for military purposes during the French and Indian War will continue to be of use during the American Revolution, and the new revolutionary and state governments in both Pennsylvania and Maryland will continue to build and expand. Moreover, and importantly, these roads will serve as nexuses of development for a road system that will be incorporated into toll roads and, at least in part, in the national road system designed by Congress. Moreover, these roads formed early economic arteries pivotal to the expansion of the economy of middle Appalachia, including roads that connected western Maryland with Philadelphia and Baltimore with western Virginia, opening up gateways past the Appalachian Mountains, until the construction of canals and railroads begin in the mid-nineteenth century.[77]

The connections with Baltimore for this region were being constructed but remained tenuous, particularly when it came to bulky goods, although religious organizations, whether churches or societies, worked to ensure that people had access to them. During the winter of

[76] Ibid., 1328.

[77] Dunaway, *The First American Frontier,* 2015.

1786, for instance, Ayres spent a few days "Sorting & Pricing a Number of Books Bro't from Baltimore for the use of our Societies." The Society he is referring to here is the Pittsburgh Conference of the Methodist Church, the church he would be a member of until 1789, when he switched to the Episcopalian church (for reasons that are not explained). He did make occasional trips east to Baltimore and Philadelphia, showing again that connections existed for both.[78]

Ayres also speaks of the character of frontier society that was developing in middle Appalachia in the last few decades of eighteenth century. These discussions with the residents also give insight into the challenges facing middle Appalachians after independence and shows that many of the issues facing the regions were ones that were faced before and during the Revolution, and this shaped frontier society and politics. On the character of frontier society, Ayres did not express much approval. In one case, he preached at a funeral of a "poor Man (that died of an Accidental Wound of a Gun)…but a great many of them were Intoxicated w. Liquor poor Mortals hastening to eternal Pain…" Ayres, who had spent his early career preaching among the established towns and plantations of eastern Maryland and Delaware, was probably shocked by the difference he experienced in middle Appalachia. Whether these people were "hastening to eternal Pain" or not, they were producing and imbibing large amounts of hard liquor. Indeed, middle Appalachia will be the epicenter of the Whiskey Rebellion.[79]

He also met a few individuals whose brief stories he described can be excellent lenses by which to understand society in middle Appalachia. In 1786, in one of the first times he crossed the Ohio River, he crossed with a "man Who had been Dispossess'd of his living, in the Indian Land by the Soldiers." This occurred because, according to that man, the soldiers were doing so

[78] Journal of Robert Ayres. Box 1, Folder 3, The Paper of Robert Ayres 1785-1837.

[79] Ibid.

"to an order of Congress" and they "Ruin'd all his Buildings & fencing, & Broke off the young Apple trees…" on his land. This episode speaks to several issues confronting middle Appalachians.[80]

First, Indian attacks were still occurring, if less commonly, in middle Appalachia. In southwestern Pennsylvania, he preached to a group of people "on the Fronteers" where there was "great talk of the Indians Who lately kill'd and taken Some, in the Settlement, some have fled, and some Forted and those Seem affrighted…" A few days later he preached to a group of people who "are a little afraid of the Indians also…"[81]

Just as settlers in middle Appalachia were dealing with the receding Indian threat and issues relating to land ownership, they were also arriving in increasing numbers. As they arrived, they began to farm establish towns, and establish mills. By the late 1780s, Ayres' journal is replete with mentions of mills and towns. In 1786, he stops at "a large new Mill, tho't the best in Redstone" and at another mill later that year called "Jones's Mill" near "Stoney Creek Glades", which while relatively poor compared to the "Redstone & Ohio" lands, was still being settled by increasing numbers of settlers. Moreover, he spoke of "Washington Town (which is the greatest Town I have Seen on the Western Waters)…" Washington was the county seat of Washington County, Pennsylvania, a region which underwent settlement as a hinterlands to Pittsburgh beginning in the colonial period.[82]

Finally, during his travels, Ayres also met a man named Herman Husband who "…entertain'd with a Variety of Singular and Wonderful Opinions or Rather Notions Concerning

[80] Ibid.

[81] Ibid.

[82] Ibid.

the New Jerusalem, the Construction of the Scriptures & he maintains that the Alleghany Mountain is the Wall of the New Jerusalem…" that the "garden of Eden lies to the Westerd within the Said Walls…" and many other things that are "too tedious to Insert" into his journal. This meeting with Herman Husband is important both because of his religious theories as a Methodist living in middle Appalachia, but also because, although Herman had legal problems, he came to a region that was politically and socially insular, at least much more so than those to the west. Beginning in the 1790s and early nineteenth century, however, the insularity of middle Appalachia will be challenged economy, politically, and socially by both regional and national forces.

The revolutionary period touched off economic, social, and political changes in middle Appalachia. The construction of roads, the introduction of new voting rights and increased representation for new counties created in middle Appalachia, and growing settlement all created capitalist expansion in the region. As the chapters two and three have shown, the second wave of settlers in the 1780s brought new economic development, labor arrangements that reflected the eastern parts of their state, including unfree labor. Moreover, politically, middle Appalachians began to be much more active in state politics (mainly because they were given the ability to do so). Indeed, it was these second-wave settlers that triggered the transitional period of the 1790s; including both the political and economic changes that triggered social changes in the nineteenth century.

As these second-wave settlers arrived in middle Appalachia, the region underwent early integration into state and national politics. Political and social disagreements in middle Appalachia contributed to disturbances, like the Whiskey Rebellion, of the 1790s. Robert Ayres previews this in his travels through the region because there is also increased agricultural and

industrial production, town creation, and incorporation into broader capitalist systems outside of middle Appalachia with metropoles in the east (and later, in the west with the growth of Pittsburgh).

The beginnings of outside investment, previewed by the construction of the Alliance Iron Works in Fayette County in 1789-90 also gives insight into these capitalist relations. As second-wave settlers like Margaret Hutton come into the region they are bringing labor relations established in the east with them, they are also bringing concepts of race and class developed there. The constitutions of Pennsylvania and Maryland give insight into this also, with the battles over voting rights and the eventual exclusion of blacks from the political system in both Maryland and Pennsylvania.

Chapter 4
Middle Appalachia in Transition: Social and Economic Growth, 1790-1800

Middle Appalachia underwent a transition during the 1790s which triggered economic, social, and political changes throughout the region. The second wave of settlers that arrived in the 1780s created new capitalist market connections, solidified economic advances made in the 1780s, and further established middle Appalachia as both a center of agricultural and industrial production that was at the heart of competition between three metropoles, Pittsburgh, Baltimore, and Philadelphia.

The economic changes were contested, however, as evidenced by the Whiskey Rebellion that developed in the early 1790s which culminated in a military intervention by the Washington administration. The Whiskey Rebellion, caused by taxes on distilled spirits enacted by Congress, inflamed consistent issues in middle Appalachia from before the Revolution, such as lack of infrastructure, lack of hard currency, and the appearance of disinterest of eastern elites when dealing with western issues. Indeed, it was local middle Appalachians, as much as outside investors and speculators, who wished to create market connections to move their goods and produce to national and international markets.[1]

The Whiskey Rebellion had a profound effect on middle Appalachia not only by crystallizing long-standing issues but also by changing the region's political dynamics. A rural region that was consistently supportive of Federalist candidates switched into a stronghold of Republican support. The divide between the towns and rural areas also became apparent as

[1] Ferguson, *Early Western Pennsylvania Politics*, 126-127; Bouton, *Taming Democracy: "The People," the Founders, and the Troubled Ending of the American Revolution* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 223-224; Elkins and McKitrick, *The Age of Federalism*, 470-473.

Federalists still had support in the towns (and Pittsburgh) but the interests of towns and rural areas diverged as they became economically differentiated throughout the nineteenth century.

The Whiskey Rebellion also shows how middle Appalachia was transitioning due to settlement and integration into regional and national economic systems by giving insights into towns, labor, and the social stratification. During the 1790s, the middle Appalachian economy began to diversify away from agricultural production. Along with the more traditional agricultural economy, extractive resources and small-scale industries developed, drawing upon both free and unfree labor. The agricultural and industrial mixed economy required the use of both free and unfree labor, especially in interracial worksites. It also produced mixed labor worksites, or places where people categorized as free and unfree labor (slaves) worked alongside one another, different from but often overlapping with interracial worksites, where people of different races worked side by side.

Interracial worksites grew in the 1790s as the population, both free and enslaved, of African Americans grew. The African American community developed a growing complexity in the 1790s, forming trends that continued into the nineteenth century, including the growth of all-black, independent households and the growth of a free black community intertwined with unfree blacks, and growing prosperity for members of the African American community. In the nineteenth century, this growing prosperity reinforced and increased racism; a trend that began when slaveholders like Margaret Hutton began freeing her slaves and continued as the divide between slavery and freedom grew into a true borderland.

The 1790s was also a transitional period for the integration of middle Appalachia into the national economy. The production of agricultural and extractive goods had residents of middle Appalachia pushing their respective state assemblies to construct meaningful infrastructure

connections that crossed the Pennsylvania-Maryland state line and connected northern Virginia to markets in middle Appalachia. Not only would these connect the region with outside metropoles like Baltimore, Pittsburgh, and Philadelphia, but it also foreshadowed major infrastructure projects that both the state and federal government undertook in the early- to mid-nineteenth century.

When Robert Ayres was working the Methodist circuit in middle Appalachia in the 1780s, he met Herman Husband, the son of a tobacco planter and slaveholder born in 1724 in Maryland. Husband proved to be interesting to Ayres because he had strange religious ideas about the nature of the Appalachian Mountains, the role of government, and his place in the whole system. In 1739, he converted to Christianity, despite his father's desire that he remain an Anglican plantation owner in tidewater Maryland. His family originally lived on the border of middle Appalachia, where his grandfather, a former indentured servant, gained his freedom and married a landed widow. By such a good marriage, his grandfather and father obtained law enforcement posts, furthered their land holdings, and opened a small ironworks. Herman, therefore, was born into a wealthy family. When he was still a boy, his family bought a plantation near the Susquehanna River and there Herman Husband grew into adulthood.[2]

Throughout his twenties and thirties, Husband remained an active Quaker who continued the family business, although he owned no slaves personally. By his thirties, he became a diversified planter and businessmen and was reasonably wealthy. By the 1750s, speculation in the Appalachian Mountains had become very fashionable among the elites of Maryland and Husband set his eyes on western North Carolina. Joining with some wealthy businessmen from

[2] William Hogeland, *The Whiskey Rebellion: George Washington, Alexander Hamilton, and the Frontier Rebels Who Challenged America's Newfound Sovereignty* (New York: Scribner, 2006), 71-72.

Maryland, he began to buy thousands of acres of land, joining a class of speculators which became the norm in southern Appalachia.[3]

Unlike middle Appalachia, Appalachian North Carolina was relatively lightly settled but undergoing rapid settlement prior to the Revolution. Once Husband moved there he quickly became popular among his fellow residents; he was elected to the colonial assembly in the 1760s. In the assembly, he advocated strongly for his constituents who chafed under the control of eastern elites; like many of his neighbors he developed a sectional view of interests. Unlike the eastern elites in the assembly, whose ire was focused on the imperial government and the crisis they were triggering, Husband focused his attacks on the eastern elite like other westerners in Middle Appalachia who adopted the language of anti-British protest to specifically attack established colonial elites.[4]

Despite tepid support from the royal governor, Western North Carolinians began to organize themselves, using a militia system already established during the colonial period and used during the Revolution and to maintain slave regimes in the south. They called themselves the Regulators-- their goal was to regulate the government and ensure more equitable representation for westerners. The Regulators were cut short, however, as the colonial governor was forced to call out the colonial militia, and at the Battle of Alamance, the government forces defeated the Regulators. Although Husband attempted to stop the violence before it could happen, he was unsuccessful. After his plantation was seized, he fled the colony north, first to Fort Cumberland in Maryland and then into southwestern Pennsylvania. There he settled in

[3] Hogeland, *The Whiskey Rebellion*, 78-79; Dunaway, *The First American Frontier*, 53-56.

[4] Hogeland, *The Whiskey Rebellion*, 79, 81.

Bedford and began to build a farmstead, where he would remain through the Revolution and into the 1790s.[5]

Albert Gallatin had a different path into middle Appalachia. Whereas Husband was a religiously motivated Quaker, Gallatin was a highly educated Swiss-born migrant. Having corresponded with Voltaire in his youth, Gallatin was a wealthy, well-connected young man who saw his future in America. Upon establishing American contacts both in Europe and the American mainland, Gallatin traveled to America, settling in Boston to teach French while waiting to inherit a small fortune from his father. He spent a year in Boston before travelling to Philadelphia where he sought a job teaching French at the University of Pennsylvania. It was in Philadelphia that he first began to eye, and then speculate in, western lands. He found a partner and invested in twenty-thousand acres of western Virginian land. After spending a month in Richmond dealing with the claims, Gallatin began eyeing the Ohio Country, including the region around Pittsburgh. In 1784, he made a trip to the region but was turned off from fully investing because persistent Indian attacks in the region. By 1785, Gallatin had taken an "oath of allegiance and fidelity to the Commonwealth of Virginia" and, finding the Virginian claims in the region satisfactory, set up a store and their base of operations in Fayette County, Pennsylvania.[6]

Beginning in 1786, Gallatin continued to purchase more land, clear it, build houses, and tend the store that he and his partner had established in Fayette County. Gallatin also spent the

[5] Hogeland, *The Whiskey Rebellion*, 82-85; Middlekauff, *The Glorious Cause*, 182-83; Marjoleine Kars, *Breaking Loose Together: The Regulator Rebellion in Pre-Revolutionary North Carolina* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002).

[6] Henry Adams, *The Life of Albert Gallatin* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott & Co., 1879), 8, 25, 46, 54, 62. There has been surprisingly little work done on the life of Albert Gallatin in recent years, most appear only alongside works that study Thomas Jefferson and James Madison's presidential administrations.

last half of the 1780s getting involved in the politics of the emerging Constitution, with debates across Pennsylvania getting his attention. Gallatin was not present at the Pennsylvania ratifying convention, although he did oppose the Constitution. He was present, however, at the Harrisburg Convention, a rump convention convened to suggest amendments to the Constitution; joining a growing antifederalist movement in Pennsylvania. When the Pennsylvania legislature moved to call a state constitutional convention, Gallatin joined the resistance, even mobilizing opposition in the western counties. He was a representative to the state constitutional convention where he fought for a more democratic constitution in line with the revolutionary Pennsylvania constitution of 1776.[7]

Many westerners joined Gallatin in their opposition to the new federal Constitution. For most, the Constitution presented many problems including the lack of safeguards for individual rights, the minimization of state government power, a too strong executive, the centralization of judiciary function in the federal government, and the threat of a standing federal army. Westerners who supported the Constitution primarily came from Pittsburgh and Washington (in Washington County), who tended to be more conservative and remained "Federalist islands in a sea of democracy."[8]

Although a much more conservative constitution was adopted by Pennsylvania in 1790, Gallatin carried his opposition into the new state legislature to both the federal and state constitutions. There he served until 1793, getting a thorough education in government. As he said, "The laboring oar was left almost exclusively to me. In the session of 1791-1792 I was put on thirty-five committees, prepared all their reports, and drew all their bills." Furthermore, he

[7] Ibid., 66-68, 76-79, 80-81.

[8] Ferguson, *Early Western Pennsylvania Politics*, 79, 90.

said, that the "spirit of internal improvements had not yet been awakened…the first turnpike-road…from Philadelphia to Lancaster was met with my warm support." And finally, that "it was in the fiscal department that I was particularly employed, and the circumstances of the times favored the restoration of the finances of the State."[9] These two details of his time in the state legislature were important to his later success as Thomas Jefferson's Secretary of the Treasury. Indeed, it would be Gallatin that fought for the National, or Cumberland, Road to be constructed in the early nineteenth century which would cement capitalist market relations in middle Appalachia.

In 1793, Gallatin took a seat in the United States Senate and became an ardent opponent of slavery. As a senator, he authored a petition against slavery because it was "inconsistent with every principle of humanity, justice, and right."[10] With this language, it seems as if Gallatin joined many other immigrants and Pennsylvanians from the upper class who opposed slavery on ideological and moral grounds. Indeed, when it came to expansion of the United States, particularly with the Louisiana Purchase and the conflict with Mexico, Gallatin was consistently concerned with the growth of the slave power; indeed, by the 1840s, Gallatin was in regular correspondence with abolitionists and opposed the expansion of slavery.[11] Gallatin was also a constant opponent of Alexander Hamilton's financial plans for the United States. Because of

[9] Adams, *The Life of Albert Gallatin*, 84-85.

[10] Ibid., 671.

[11] Ibid., 671-674. This was a period of sectionalization of the slavery issue, including stiffening resistance to slavery by those who were already predisposed to oppose slavery, for more see Leonard L. Richards, *The Slave Power: The Free North and Southern Domination, 1780-1860* (Baton Rouge: LSU Press, 2000) which argues that the "slave power thesis became far more widespread in the North after the perception of continuous victories by pro-slavery southerners; David Waldstreicher's *Slavery's Constitution: From Revolution to Ratification* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2010) which argues that the Constitution was explicitly pro-slavery, a feeling that spread throughout the North in the late antebellum period; David G. Smith, *On the Edge of Freedom: The Fugitive Slave Issue in South Central Pennsylvania, 1820-1870* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2012), which shows that slavery rapidly became a contentious political issue along the Mason-Dixon Line.

opposition to Hamilton's plans, Pennsylvania Federalists fought against Gallatin by questioning his citizenship. The senate expelled him in 1794 along a party line vote for not meeting the minimum requirements of citizenship, thereby giving him the dubious honor of being the first senator expelled from that body.[12]

Upon his return to Fayette County, Gallatin found a restive region due to policies enacted by Congress and supported by the Washington administration. When Alexander Hamilton was appointed to head the Treasury Department by Washington, he brought with him the experience of dealing with the ineffectual Confederation Congress. This experience, combined with being a close lieutenant of Washington, positioned Hamilton perfectly as a man who wished to create a strong, central government with the ability to project power like a European state.[13]

Beginning in 1790, Hamilton submitted a series of reports to Congress to help create financial stability for the newly created republic. The most controversial of these proposals was the assumption of states' debts, the funding of those debts, and the creation of a national bank to make the system work. Key to his system was a funded debt, which would help create good credit for the United States; key to the funded debt was a putting a tax on distilled spirits. While the entire financial system was not dependent on whiskey, it was the closest thing to it.[14]

The problem with a tax on whiskey was twofold: first, it would affect small producers hardest, and second, it would hurt the economy of the frontier regions of the United States. For the people settling in middle Appalachia, however, the tax on whiskey was not their only

---

[12] Wendy Wolff, "Case 1: Albert Gallatin" in *Senate Election, Expulsion and Censure Cases from 1793 to 1990* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1995), 3–5.

[13] For a full accounting of Alexander Hamilton's written plans as Secretary of the Treasury and the reception of those plans, see Gordon Wood, *Empire of Liberty*, 103-110; Elkins and McKitrick, *The Age of Federalism*, 119-123; Sharp, *The New Nation in Crisis*, 38-41.

[14] James Roger Sharp, *The New Nation in Crisis*, 34.

problem. Therefore, the tax added more pressure onto a population that was primed by other economic factors; as one historian has said, it was "last, intolerable stroke in a long flogging."[15]

Part of this flogging that historians are still coming to understand is the effects of pests on grain crops in the United States after independence. The mid-Atlantic and upper south regions were transitioning to grain crops in the 1770s and 1780s; it helped spur the transformation of the Maryland economy and frontier settlement in both Pennsylvania and Maryland along with transforming slavery. It should not have been difficult, then, to find flower, especially on the frontier where mills were abundant. In May 1790, William Turnbull was desperately trying to supply his forge and he "was fortunately met with Twenty barrels of flower at red Stone [Redstone], for which I was under the necessity to give Eight dollars [per] barrel and a very great favor to get more than ten barrels…"[16]

While part of this could be the seasonality of the grain crop; another could be the Hessian fly. The Hessian fly made its way to North America in the 1770s where it began to destroy wheat crops in the northern colonies. It became so bad and so widespread that Britain cut off grain imports in 1788 from the United States. France, whose government was already buckling under the strain of bad harvests and enormous debts, was hit doubly hard by lessening imports from the United States as the fly took its toll on grain harvests. As the Hessian fly spread south, originating in New England, it began to change American agriculture; supplanting the older grain culture with a new, more diversified system. It also sped up the transformation of agriculture in

[15] Hogeland, *The Whiskey Rebellion*, 33.

[16] Turnbull to Holker, Pittsburgh, 15 May 1790. Folder 2. John Holker Papers 1770-1814. Library and Archives Division, Senator John Heinz History Center.

the upper South, particularly in Virginia and Maryland.[17] By the 1790s, the problem had become large enough that it was impacting the now-booming grain trade.

The Pennsylvania Supreme Executive Council had tasked the Philadelphia Society for the Promotion of Agriculture to explore ways of stopping the Hessian fly. The Society offered awards for best experiment in crop rotations, the greatest quantity of manure collected in one years, and the best way in preventing damage to crops by insects.[18] The Hessian fly spread throughout Pennsylvania and Maryland in the 1790s despite the advice of the Society and farmers and plantation owners began to diversify their crops. Corn was a major crop replacement for farmers; so important that millers began to grind corn and wheat together prompting laws fining the practice in Pennsylvania and Maryland.[19]

While wheat was a staple crop, despite the disruptions of the Hessian fly, so whiskey was a staple product of middle Appalachia. The cost of shipping grains to the east was too high for the cost of production and the economic connections west, to the Ohio River, had not yet formed. The ability to produce whiskey was critical to the middle Appalachian economy not just for farmers, who tended to also be small distillers, but also because it formed a critical component of an informal exchange economy. Finally, the tax increased the price of whiskey, which angered many in the region; in short, people liked their cheap drink.[20]

---

[17]Brooke Hunter, "Creative Destruction: The Forgotten Legacy of the Hessian Fly" in *The Economy of Early America: Historical Perspectives and New Directions* ed. Cathy Matson (Philadelphia: Penn State University Press, 2006), 237, 239.

[18] Ibid., 247-248.

[19] Ibid., 259-60.

[20] Thomas and Williams, *History of Allegany County, Maryland***,** 163**.**

At the same time Congress levied a tax on whiskey, the socioeconomic factors of middle Appalachia were changing. First, the population had moved into settled towns with the percentage of landownership declining. Moreover, with the rise of towns, a class structure had more visibly formed, increasing the polarization of society and creating a group of elites that included both speculators in land but also large landowners that inhabited the region. Men like Albert Gallatin and Edward Cook are excellent examples—these men became moderate regional leaders in middle Appalachia who took an active role in the Whiskey Rebellion.[21]

These yeoman farmers became key components of an emerging class system in middle Appalachia, born out of capitalist development. Class as a system of understanding socioeconomic development is important to middle Appalachia because of the absence of a major urban center (Pittsburgh is the closest but does not dominate the region as the sole urban area) and the rural nature of the region with both agricultural, extractive, and manufacturing industry. The absence of an urban center, which has traditionally been the focus of class studies, did not stop the formation of class, and indeed, the 1790s was a transitional period in respect to class in largely rural middle Appalachia.[22]

The lower class of middle Appalachia falls into three categories: landless, most likely transitory but some permanent landless people; tenants who rented lands from the growing upper class of the region; laborers who did both agricultural and industrial work; and African

---

[21] Harper, *Transformation of Western Pennsylvania*, 30, 39; Boyd Crumrine, Franklin Ellis, and Austin N. Hungerford. *History of Washington County, Pennsylvania: with biographical sketches of many of its pioneers and prominent men* (Philadelphia: H. L. Everts & Co., 1882)**,** 168**.**

[22] My understanding of the issue of class in early America comes from the Symposium on Class in the Early Republic, published by the *Journal of the Early Republic* 44, no. 2 (Winter 2005). Specifically Gary J. Kornblith, "Introduction to the Symposium on Class in the Early Republic," Seth Rockman, "Class and the History of Working People in the Early Republic," Jennifer L. Goloboy, "The Early American Middle Class," and Andrew M. Schocket, "Thinking about Elites in the Early Republic."

Americans, both enslaved and in the process of achieving freedom. The lower class, particularly landless and laborers, generally congregated around the growing towns of the region. This is especially true of laborers and African Americans; the latter whose presence along the border was tenuous at best.[23]

African Americans were unique for those placed in the lower class. In middle Appalachia, tenants had a reasonable expectation to move up socially and economically, at least until the mid-nineteenth century. Laborers, who in middle Appalachia were much more mobile and transient than in especially the eastern city, also had some reasonable expectations of moving up socially and economically. African Americans, on the other hand, had no such expectations nor did it occur, at least socially.

African Americans, like in the rest of the United States, remained socially at the bottom of society even after freedom. In middle Appalachia, as these independent households grew during the transition period and into the nineteenth century, they remained a point of contention socially as their economic success grew. A majority of free blacks remained economically lower class but some did break into the economic middle class. The movement into the economic middle class ensured that poorer whites in the region consistently felt at least some degree of racial animosity towards the more successful blacks in middle Appalachia.[24]

Above this relatively small lower, working class was the middle class which was the largest socioeconomic group. This group consisted overwhelming of landowning farmers but

---

[23] For my understanding of race and class see Dunaway, *Slavery in the American Mountain South*; Dunaway, *The First American Frontier*; Isenberg, *White Trash: The 400-Year Untold History of Class in America* (New York: Penguin Books, 2017); Rockman, "Liberty is Land and Slaves: The Great Contradiction" *OAH Magazine of History* 19, no. 3, Market Revolution (May 2005), 8-11.

[24] Fields, *Slavery and Freedom on the Middle Ground*, 69-71; Gigantino, *The Ragged Road to Abolition*, 197-200; Nash and Soderlund, *Freedom by Degrees*, 167-8, 173.

also included town professionals, and like Ayres, clergymen. Robert Ayres and his wife are representative of this group. Largely landowners, though professional groups such as lawyers, doctors, and government officials also fit into this category, they were the most settled of the groups. As agriculture became the predominant economic activity of middle Appalachians, these groups were largely prosperous in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century. The land acquisitions made by this group fueled the agricultural boom of the early republic.

These elites not only dominated the class structure of the region but also helped drive economic development. Business enterprises, agricultural development, and wealth concentration were all part of the changes in middle Appalachia driven by these elites. Most of the wealth of these men (and some women) invested in, aside from land, were gristmills, sawmills, ferries, and distilleries; by the 1790s, small scale iron production was also growing in the region. It was also a higher proportion of elites that owned slaves in region. Therefore, the whiskey tax would not only hurt the small farmers but also the emerging elite of middle Appalachia.[25]

The growth of industries and businesses, like that owned by Gallatin, helped to increase the number of both tenants and the landless. Tenancy was common by 1790s in middle Appalachia. Due to the number of transients and tenants in the region, during the 1790s there is some evidence of upward mobility in the region. Opportunity was closing, however, as the 1790s continued. The growth of towns also created a pool of laborers for agricultural work. While unfree laborers were critical to the early economy, free laborers also comprised an important component of the labor pool in the region. The reliance on free labor increased as the population increased and towns formed, creating a labor pool, such as in Cumberland, Maryland.

[25] Harper, *Transformation of Western Pennslyvania*, 40-47, 53-55.

A significant portion of agricultural labor came from towns throughout middle Appalachia, both permanent and temporary in nature. Thus, towns were critical not only to the growth of markets and the economy during the 1790s but also a source of labor.[26]

With the growth of towns and a small but growing labor supply, industries became a growing source of employment. Mill sites and local industries grew up around towns, which themselves generally grew up around water sites. In Fayette County, Pennsylvania, for instance, the original settlements occurred along rivers and other water sources, these areas were also where slaves were concentrated. With the rise of towns as a place of industry and employment; they also became important sources of investment. As both Edward Cook and Margaret Hutton show, investment in towns became an important source of investment and growth.[27]

Small towns served important roles in middle Appalachia, primarily as trading centers, providing opportunities for common laborers to find opportunities for employment that were not necessarily tied to agriculture, town real estate became important sources of investment, became the center of governments, and were the primary source of both intellectual and cultural developments.[28] Many of the earliest towns were homes to forts and important to frontier defense but the villages which grew around them were "patterned after European market villages" that served as centralized areas for the local region. Towns were home to both increasing numbers of poor and had the highest concentration of slaves in middle Appalachia. Towns became the economic, social, political, and cultural centers of middle Appalachia life; organizationally this began in earnest in the transitional period of the 1790s. Towns like Union

[26] Harper, *Transformation of Western Pennslyvania*, 68; Dunaway, *The First American Frontier*, 106-107.

[27] Harper, *Transformation of Western Pennslyvania*, 81, 85.

[28] Ibid., 89.

(later Uniontown), Cumberland, and Washington all became important centers, actively linked with infrastructure developments and feeding into the three major cities outside of the region: Pittsburgh (the dominant city especially for those towns in Pennsylvania), Baltimore, and Philadelphia. [29]

Cumberland, the largest town in Allegany County, Maryland, is an excellent example of the growth and importance of towns. First constructed as a fort during the French and Indian War and used by Washington on his ill-fated campaign against Fort Duquesne, Cumberland served as the westernmost point of settlement in Maryland through the Revolution. It was not until the mid-1780s that Cumberland was home to a permanent and growing settlement and the Maryland legislature created the town 1786. During the 1780s and 1790s, Cumberland grew as the region around it grew. Cumberland is located on Will's Creek, both a crossroads of north-south traffic and east-west, particularly beginning in the 1790s. Cumberland also became an important trading center, as a processing center for agricultural goods, a center of milling and other small-scale industry, and, just as importantly, a stop on the journey into the Ohio country. While roads consistently provided the best means of travel for those coming into and passing through Cumberland (as evidenced by the construction of the Cumberland Road in the early nineteenth century), Cumberland was also important as a place of water transit. Situated as it was on Will's Creek and the North Branch of the Potomac River, Cumberland also became a center for water-borne traffic, although it was especially difficult and seasonal.[30] Finally,

[29] Harper, *Transformation of Western Pennsylvania*, 81.; Dunaway, *The First American Frontier*, 59.

[30] Thomas and Williams, *History of Allegany County, Maryland*, 93-105.

Cumberland also had the highest concentration of slaves in Allegany County and the trend of towns having high black populations continued.[31]

The 1790s was a transitional period for towns as they became the center of economic activity in middle Appalachia. They truly were "hubs of commercial interaction" with both neighboring towns and with regions and cities out of middle Appalachia. Cumberland and Hagerstown in Maryland and Uniontown became what Wilma Dunaway calls "bulking centers" for adjacent villages, "agricultural hinterlands, and extractive enclaves."[32] By the nineteenth century, Cumberland, Maryland became the major bulking center in southern middle Appalachia, linking the region to Baltimore.[33] At the same time, Hagerstown developed as a center of milling and distilleries, processing much of the produce that was "bulked" in Cumberland and transshipping it to Baltimore.[34]

Bulking and processing was central to the town economy and provided the means for the upper class to solidify their socioeconomic status. The "small towns on the western Pennsylvania frontier" operated to serve as "trading centers," which allowed people to bring goods into town for bulking and shipment and to trade goods. It also "provided opportunities for common laborers and dependent people" to achieve some economic security by learning a trade, establishing businesses, or gaining enough money and credit to purchase land. Therefore, towns were also important to achieve economic status and security.[35]

---

[31] Ancestry.com *1790 United States Federal Census* [database on-line]. Provo, UT, USA: Ancestry.com Operations Inc. 2010. First Census of the United States, 1790 (NARA microfilm publication M637, 12 rolls). Records of the Bureau of the Census, Record Group 29. National Archives, Washington, D.C., Allegany County, Maryland.

[32] Dunaway, *The First American Frontier*, 199.

[33] Ibid., 199.

[34] Ibid., 201.

[35] Harper, *Transformation of Western Pennsylvania*, 89.

These "bulking centers" also developed on the Pennsylvania side of the line, connecting local centers of economic activity with outside points both east, west, and south into Maryland. By the end of the 1790s there were over a dozen growing towns in northern middle Appalachia. There it also exposes another role of towns in the economic and social structure of middle Appalachia: cheap investment and land acquisition opportunities. This is an opportunity that Robert Ayres took advantage of in the late 1790s as he views land in town as an investment opportunity. While a great opportunity for the middle and upper class, it also led to social polarization between the upper and lower classes. All towns in middle Appalachia had important road connections to the major economic centers and during the 1790s both states were active seeking to connect this to their own economic centers (Baltimore in Maryland, Pittsburgh or Philadelphia, depending on the location of the official who wished to do the connecting, in Pennsylvania).[36]

It was with these changes occurring in middle Appalachia that the whiskey tax added pressure to the regional economy; importantly, it added pressure on all segments of society. This added pressure forced people in southwestern Pennsylvanians to organize. Following the model of Revolutionary politics, they organized into committees of correspondence. They then began to issue statements regarding the tax and addressing the economic disruptions of the tax. Beginning with a committee formed in Washington County in 1791 and continuing through to a conference of counties in Pittsburgh in 1792, many of their complaints echoed complaints that

[36] Harper, *Transformation of Western Pennsylvania*, 81-83. Diary of Robert Ayres, Box 1, Folder 4, Papers of Robert Ayres, 1785-1837. The land records of the 1790s are replete with evidence of these investments in town properties.

they had since prior to the Revolution. Moreover, their arguments against the excise tax also reflected the growing market connections of the foundational period of the 1780s.[37]

The second complaint predates the Revolution and speaks to the importance of whiskey in the local economy. While the people of the region are happy to pay taxes, they should be taxes on "estates and possessions" which was far more equitable. However, the tax on whiskey hurts more because of their "scarcity of cash" (a long-running complaint of the region) and because the tax was "four times as large as any taxes" levied on those estates and possessions.[38]

Just as important as these complaints about the scarcity of cash, the unfairness of the tax, and the lack of markets for the produce of the region, another important issue that no doubt played a role in the attitudes of middle Appalachians: the problem of western Indians. While Indian attacks and raids in middle Appalachia had essentially ended, Indian conflicts were a continuing story of the United States throughout the 1790s and well into the nineteenth century. Beginning in earnest in the 1780s and 1790s, the Northwest Territory became a site of major settlement. A continuation of middle Appalachian settlement, settlement in the Northwest Territory caused Indian unrest.[39]

Under the command of Pennsylvanian Josiah Harmer, troops were sent by the Secretary of War under the Confederation government in the 1780s to construct forts in the territory to help expel squatters in order to forestall hostilities with Indians. Like so many times before, this effort was unsuccessful and continued pressure on settlers in the region forced Harmer to attempt a

---

[37] For some of the petitions and redresses, see *The Selected Writings of Albert Gallatin,* ed. James E. Ferguson (New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1967).; Sharp, *The New Nation in Crisis,* 99-101; Bouton, *Taming Democracy,* 219-226.

[38] Ibid., 88-89.

[39] Gordon S. Wood, *Empire of Liberty,* 129.

show of strength against the Indians. The attempt ended in failure; while the army claimed a victory, it was pyrrhic in nature and emboldened the Indian of the Ohio region.[40]

Washington then appointed General Arthur St. Clair as governor of the Northwest in 1791. St. Clair led an army against Indians and was surprised by an Indian force which soundly defeated the army in November 1791 and was one the major defeats inflicted on the United States by Indians. The Ohio region continued to be a site of contention for Indians and the United States into the nineteenth century which was not lost on the people of middle Appalachia, whose memory did not have to stretch far into the past for their own dealings with Indian wars and raids.[41]

The issue of Indians in the added to the mix of grievances in middle Appalachia in the early 1790s. Gallatin warned, after the failure of St. Clair's army that "our frontiers are naked; the Indians must be encouraged by their success," and indeed, the problem did not escape the federal and state governments, for that defeat was "the event which mostly engrosses the public attention."[42] While Gallatin's position in government forced him to deal with these issues; it also weighed on the minds of those who lived and invested in the economy of the region. William Turnbull and Peter Marmie, who were looking to construct an iron manufactory, worried about the Indians on the frontier. In 1788, as he was making plans for an iron furnace, he was concerned because "there is very little prospect of any Treaty taking place with the Indians, every circumstance of their conduct has a hostile appearance…"[43]

---

[40] Ibid., 129.

[41] Ibid., 129-30.

[42] Adams, *The Life of Albert Gallatin*, 89.

[43] Turnbull to Holker, Pittsburgh September 24th, 1788. Folder 2. John Holker Papers 1770-1814. MFF 2249, Library and Archives Division, Senator John Heinz History Center.

After hearing news of the defeat of "our Army under Governor St. Clair," Turnbull hoped that Congress realized how "the bad plan of attacking the Savages-by raw undisciplined troops" and that a "different sistem be adopted or we had better let them have full way…"[44] Still, in 1792, Turnbull was so concerned on a trip back from Philadelphia because he "had such disagreeable accounts from Pittsburgh of the depredations of the Indians both up the Allegany and betwixt this place and Wheeling" that he decided to leave his wife in the east. The turbulence of the frontier zone was thus effecting not only business but also the personal lives of those who were interested in investing in the region.[45]

In Pittsburgh, representatives from southwestern Pennsylvania counties met to issue a protest against the excise tax. Filled mainly with landowning moderates, including men like Gallatin and Cook, the latter was elected chair of the convention, their language reflected the politics of the Revolution and the economy of the 1790s. They were also joined by men who had a history of resistance, like Herman Husband, whose radical vision of government ran counter to their own.[46] The lack of integrated market connections is the first, when they argued that they were "Distant from a permanent market" and so they had "no means of bringing the produce of our lands to sale either in grain or in meal." Thus, in order to be economically viable, the farmers in the region were "distillers through necessity, not choice." Showing that there was still mistrust of easterners, both elites and in government, the petition went on to say that "the inhabitants of the eastern side of the montains can dispose of their grain without the additional labor of distillation at a higher price than we can…" The complaints of westerners during the

[44] Turnbull to Holker, Pittsburgh December 12th, 1791. Folder 2. John Holker Papers 1770-1814.

[45] Turnbull to Holker, Pittsburgh June 29th, 1792. Folder 2. John Holker Papers 1770-1814.

[46] Crumrine, Ellis, and Hungerford, *History of Washington County, Pennsylvania*, 288.

Revolution, therefore, had not disappeared by the 1790s; the distrust of eastern elites and of eastern state governments inspired some resentment still. [47]

Unfortunately, the proclamation was also very provocative. While some members, like Gallatin, tried to be a moderating influence on the convention, they were unsuccessful. Not only did they lay out arguments against the tax, they also had a call to action: "Whereas, some men may be found among us so far lost to every sense of virtue…to accept offices for the collection of the duty…we will consider such persons as unworthy of our friendship…and [should] on all occasions treat them with that contempt they deserve…" This proved to be a bridge too far and elicited a response from President Washington.

In September 1792, Washington issued a proclamation to "earnestly admonish and exhort all persons whom it may concern to refrain and desist from all unlawful combinations and proceedings whatsoever having for object or tending to obstruct the operation of the laws aforesaid, inasmuch as all lawful ways and means will be strictly put in execution for bringing to justice the infractors thereof and securing obedience thereto."[48] The admonition from Washington had the effect of worrying many members of the convention, especially the moderates, who feared they had overstepped legal boundaries. In a letter from Gallatin to Thomas Clare, a resident of Fayette County and large landowner, he fretted that "True it is that our meeting at Pittsburgh hurt our general interest throughout the State, and has rather defeated the object we had in view, to wit, to obtain a repeal of the excise law, as that law is now more popular than it was before our proceedings were known."[49]

---

[47] Adams, *The Life of Albert Gallatin*, 88-89.

[48] George Washington, "Proclamation 3B—Cessation of Violence and Obstruction of Justice in Protest of Liquor Laws, September 15, 1792" *The American Presidency Project* "George Washington, President of the United States: 1789-1797" accessed from http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=65427 (accessed July 27, 2017).

[49] Adams, *The Life of Albert Gallatin*, 93-94.

Even as Gallatin's attention turned elsewhere after his election to the Senate in 1792, the people of middle Appalachia continued to organize and protest the whisky law. In September 1794, Fayette County towns came together in a convention and issued a petition against the whiskey tax.[50] This petition was in response to commissioners dispatched by Washington in August to determine whether troops were necessary to suppress resistance in the region and to extend pardons should any be needed. Gallatin, present at the meeting and author of the petition, urged compliance to the law and tried to check the more extremist elements of the committee but was unsuccessful.[51] At the same time that Fayette County was being organized by men like Gallatin and Cook, support grew in Maryland. The Whiskey Boys, a group opposing the whiskey tax, raised a liberty pole in Frederick County.[52]

Unfortunately for middle Appalachia, Washington, at Hamilton's encouragement, was tired of the resistance. He issued two proclamations in 1794. The first, issued in August, called for submission to the law.[53] The second proclamation, issued in September, authorized military forces from neighboring states to suppress resistance to the law and restore order.[54]

---

[50] "Declaration of the Committees of Fayette County, September 1794," *Selected Writings of Albert Gallatin,* edited by E. James Ferguson, 20-26.

[51] Ibid., 20-21.

[52] Bruggers, *Maryland, A Middle Temperament*, 165.

[53] George Washington, "Proclamation—Cessation of Violence and Obstruction of Justice in Protest of Liquor Laws in Pennsylvania, August 7, 1794" *The American Presidency Project* "George Washington, President of the United States: 1789-1797" accessed from http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=65477 (accessed July 27, 2017).

[54] George Washington, "Proclamation—Authorizing Military Intervention to End Violence and Obstruction of Justic in Protest of Liquor Laws in Pennsylvania" *The American Presidency Project* "George Washington, President of the United States: 1789-1797" accessed from http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=65478 (accessed July 27, 2017).

Middle Appalachia was thus once again a site of military action- this time not against Indian threats of the frontier but instead against a population primed for resistance to economic policies that threatened their livelihoods. Washington marched west to suppress the rebellion, passing through Cumberland, Maryland north into southwestern Pennsylvania. Marylanders were not ignorant of what was happening to their north, nor were they unsympathetic to their complaints. While resistance to the whiskey tax was not violent in western Maryland, they did oppose it as their economy depended upon whiskey as much as that of southwestern Pennsylvania. When the military reached southwestern Pennsylvania, the supposed whiskey rebels did not put a fight, instead melted away and order returned to middle Appalachia.[55]

Most historians have emphasized the ideological and political nature of the Whiskey Rebellion with nods to the nature of a frontier economy and society in which whiskey was an important component. However, to completely understand the rebellion, it is important to also realize that the 1790s was a transitional period for middle Appalachia. Not only is town growth and social stratification occurring but so is the increasing growth of capitalist market connections in the region. The economic growth of the region, therefore, helped cause the rebellion and while the rebellion ended, it did not stop the transition of middle Appalachia into a fully integrated capitalist system that it would become in the early to mid-nineteenth century.[56]

Therefore, the Whiskey Rebellion was both a crystallizing moment for middle Appalachia and a pivotal moment for the early republic. Washington proved the importance of

---

[55] Sharp, *American Politics*, 93-98; Stanley Elkins and Eric McKitrick, *The Age of Federalism*, 461-474; Brugger, *Maryland: A Middle Temperament*, 164-165.

[56] For political and ideological interpretations along with understandings of state politics, see Saul Cornell, *Anti-Federalism & the Dissenting Tradition in America, 1788-1828*; Terry Bouton, *Taming Democracy: "The People", the Founders, and the Troubled Ending of the American Revolution*; Sharp, *American Politics in the Early Republic*; Elkins and McKitrick, *The Age of Federalism*; Gordon S. Wood, *Empire of Liberty: A History of the Early Republic, 1789-1815*; Brugger, *Maryland: A Middle Temperament*.

voting and established a strong executive role in the administration of law. For middle Appalachians, it marked a political change in which their opposition to the Constitution and tepid support for the Federalists turned into opposition to the Federalist administration and the election of newly minted Jeffersonian Republicans; a trend that continued into the nineteenth century.

Part of the transition during the 1790s was consolidation, particularly for economic and political elites in middle Appalachia. Robert Ayres, who settled down, is an excellent example of this and shows the importance and connections of leaders that led resistance during the Whiskey Rebellion. On Thursday, April 15th, 1790, Robert Ayres, accompanied by Edward Cook and Mrs. Hutton (Margaret Hutton) along with her brother William Goe, married Rachel Goe. They soon settled on a farm near Redstone, in Fayette County, Pennsylvania. Their marriage illustrates the borderland nature of middle Appalachia for while Ayres had antislavery sentiment, or at least from his journals appeared to support manumission of slaves, he married into a family which owned a significant number of slaves. Rachel's father, William Goe, owned nine slaves by the 1790 census and he still had four slaves in 1800 while family members also owned slaves, most likely given by him to his sons.[57]

Evidence from the 1798 direct tax lists points to the 1790s as a prosperous decade for the Goe and Ayres family. The Goe family continued to expand their lands while Ayres had settled on a plot of fifty acres on which he built a two-story stone house with a stable, where he kept a beloved mare. On this farm, it appears that Ayres grew potatoes, corn, wheat, along with keeping his trusty horse; he often discusses getting his crops to millers and the local markets.[58]

[57] Diary of Robert Ayres. Box 1, Folder 4.

[58] Ancestry.com. *Pennsylvania, U.S. Direct Tax Lists, 1798* [database on-line]. Provo, UT, USA: Ancestry.com Operations, Inc., 2012., accessed from https://search.ancestry.com/search/db.aspx?dbid=2060; Diary of Robert Ayres, 1788-1790. Folder 4, Papers of Robert Ayres, 1785-1837.

By 1797, Margaret Hutton had passed away and left a will to dispose of her large estate. Since her daughter and son-in-law both predeceased her, she wanted all her lands sold except for one acre, upon which they are buried, so that she may join them. She then disposed of some of her more prized possessions, including gold rings, silverware, and mahogany furniture which she gave to various family members that resided in Pennsylvania at the time. Finally, she made provisions for the slaves that were willed to her by her son-in-law and that she owned outright.[59]

According to Hutton's will, all of her slaves were to be set free upon her death, though the timing of their freedom depended both upon her death and on the age of the slave. There are two categories for her slaves, those who are older and those younger. For the "first seven undernamed Negro and Mulatto Slaves both men and women" were entitled to "enough clothing such as befits a laboring state" and are "entitled to Claim and receive…fifteen bushels of good sound Indian Corn, five bushels of Well cleaned merchantable wheat, on hundred pounds weight of well fatted pork or bacon…and thirty pounds of salt". On top of this, the men were allowed "one felling ax, one hoe one sickle and a weed scythe and…one plough with color in chains…one cow and calf" and the women were allowed a "good linen wheel or new woolen wheel with a pair of new cords, eight pounds of heckled flax five pounds of clean washed wool, one cow and calf, one eye and lamb…one iron pot or kettle with hooks, one Iron Skillet, one axe one broad hoe…"[60]

The provisions of Hutton's will for the older slaves, all of which, according to the will were in their late forties and early fifties, gives some insight into the community that African

[59] Will of Margaret Hutton, December 7, 1796. Ancestry.com. *Pennsylvania, Wills and Probate Records, 1683-1993* [database on-line]. Provo, UT, USA: Ancestry.com Operations, Inc., 2015.

[60] Ibid.

Americans constructed in middle Appalachia. First are the mixed-freedom households in which those who were enslaved and free mingled and even lived together. Hutton, who was apparently concerned about the physical, social, and spiritual wellbeing of her slaves, left "Old Jeremiah a Negro man slave aged upward of fifty years" just some advice "which I have repeatedly given him": that he should "utterly to forsake that vile hussy free Chloe, with whom he lives in open adultery and all of his wicked practices brought about by her advice acceptance and secreting". Unfortunately, there are no records for Chloe and Old Jeremiah, whether he was able to stay with her despite all of the "wicked practices" but their story does say something to the role of the African American community and the growth of all-black households in middle Appalachia. In every county in middle Appalachia there were all black households that became the foundation of the region's African American community. Moreover, these households are concentrated around the towns of middle Appalachia, particularly in Pennsylvania; there were also households established in Washington County, Maryland. The growth of this mixed-free black population contributed to the political and social struggles of the early to mid-nineteenth century and to the growth of a class system in middle Appalachia beginning in the transitional period. [61]

On the 1800 census, both William Goe Sr. and Jr. had households that contained both enslaved and free blacks. Robert Ayres also had a racially mixed household, registering black person in his household. While the gender of the person is unidentified, it could be that "Negro Girl" who helped him hoe the potatoes in 1796. Just as importantly, the number of African Americans associated with the Goe family had increased from 1790, adding numbers to father, son, and son-in-law's households.[62]

---

[61] Ibid.

[62] 1800 Census Schedule, Fayette County, Pennsylvania, Ancestry.com *1790 United States Federal Census* [database on-line]; Diary of Robert Ayres, 1788-1790. Folder 4, Papers of Robert Ayres, 1785-1837.

There are four developments that can be unpacked in the story of Robert Ayres as he established his family in the 1790s. First is the growth of agricultural production in middle Appalachia exceled after the second wave of settlers came to the region. Already a mainstay of the regional economy, agricultural production dominated until after the turn of the century when some types of industry began to develop (although the 1790s was a transitional period for this also).

The growth of agricultural production in middle Appalachia is evident from two different sources: first, the second wave settlers that arrived in earnest in the 1780s consistently settled in rural areas and established households on plots of land with most investment in the areas of best agricultural land, along the rivers and creeks of the region. Most of the settlers, speculators, and investors settled in these areas. Margaret Hutton and her extended family are examples of this, along with that of Robert Ayres when he settled down after marrying Rachel Goe. The second is the Whiskey Rebellion, an event caused by pressure from above and below; or, the growth of agriculture, taxes on the produce of that agriculture in the form of the whiskey tax, and longstanding complaints about lack of good infrastructure in the region.[63]

Family units like Ayres and his wife were the backbone of the politico-economic concept of the yeoman farmer. The concept of the yeoman farmer in the early republic is largely a myth: self-sufficiency, only voluntary ties to the market, and control of their labor and that of their family. In reality, capitalist market connections were critical to the success of farmers, no matter how large the operations. Ayres, throughout his journal, spoke of the need to find services to help process his agricultural goods, most importantly mills, which were consistently the earliest

---

[63] Harper, *The Transformation of Western Pennsylvania*, 7.

industry in middle Appalachia. Early republic middle Appalachia, however, did have high landownership among the farm families. In neither Pennsylvania nor Maryland did tenancy exceed fifteen percent in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century.[64]

The reasons behind the profitability of were numerous but primarily stemmed from the wars engulfing Europe. The French Revolution, which began in 1789, and the subsequent intervention by the major European powers, created a price increase for agricultural goods from the United States. Despite the issues arising from shipping, which came to a head in 1794 with Jay's Treaty (and later the War of 1812) and the Quasi-war with France, the American exports of grains and agricultural goods to Europe and the Caribbean increased.[65]

The surge in agricultural goods also led to a demand in labor and this demand was especially high in regions, like middle Appalachia, that focused on grain production. Farmers, whose livelihoods depended on agriculture and a steady supply of labor, were forced to innovate and rely upon practical, urgent, and sometimes extralegal means to attain that labor. That many farmers, even those who owned large amounts of slaves, actively developed grain production reflected not only the trends from the Revolutionary period in the Chesapeake but also the realities of the European market.[66]

Just as importantly as the growing middle class that was based largely on agricultural production, the growing upper class relied upon professional jobs, land accumulation (and subsequent agricultural productivity on large tracts of land), and speculators who bought up large tracts of land. Edward Cook, a lawyer that actively accumulated land and laborers, is an

---

[64] Harper, *The Transformation of Western Pennslyvania*, 62; Dunaway, *The First American Frontier*, 70, 75.

[65] Grivno, *Gleanings of Freeom*, 31-33; Berlin, *Generations of Captivity*, 113-114; Rockman, *Scraping By*, 3-4.

[66] Grivno, *Gleanings of Freedom*, 31-33.

example of members of this class. Cook consistently acquired land throughout middle Appalachia and was joined by other people like Albert Gallatin, who both invested in land, owned a store, and was active in local, state, and regional politics. Women like Margaret Hutton were also involved in this, and while they accumulated land, they were also purveyors of labor, both free and unfree, as they were large slaveholders (Hutton and Cook were the largest landholders in Fayette County).

In the 1780s, elites controlled a sizable minority of taxable wealth in the townships of middle Appalachia. The largest landowners were joined in the 1790s by newer elites who invested in the border townships and by those who invested in various processing industries (like gristmills, sawmills, distilleries, and ferries) and by newer industries like iron. These industries not only attracted the resources of economic elites in middle Appalachia but also investors from Baltimore, Pittsburgh, and Philadelphia. Most of these elites not only invested in town property but were also residents of those towns, as Edward Cook and Albert Gallatin show, which were hubs of governmental activity.[67]

The second is the nature and utilization of labor during late eighteenth and early nineteenth century in middle Appalachia. Both free and unfree labor were interchangeable and both were used in essentially every economic category: services, skilled crafts, agriculture, and what limited manufacturing existed in the late eighteenth century. This was not only expressive of the transitional nature of the region, with questions of free and unfree labor which were present or sometimes ignored, but also of the borderland nature of middle Appalachia.

As elites grew their holdings and others entered into the upper economic status, particularly in the border townships along the Mason-Dixon Line, they also sought new sources

[67] Harper, *The Transformation of Western Pennsylvania*, 47.

of labor to exploit the resources of middle Appalachia. Labor in this region included interracial workforces that included both free and unfree labor. It was in the transitional period of the 1790s that the need for labor expanded. Margaret Hutton's will gives evidence to how people in the region fulfilled their need for labor. While Hutton's older slaves were granted large amounts of property, and in some cases cash, along with their freedom, her younger slaves were not so lucky. Hutton made provisions for her estate by hiring out younger slaves, both men and women, for at least one year apiece after her death. For slaves in their teens, such as "Abram a negro lad slave aged upward of eighteen years and his half-sister Cassandra a Negro girl slave aged fifteen years" were to "be sold or hired out as my property" until January 1, 1805 "which period of time they that is said Abram and his half-sister Cassandrea shall go out free" and receive twelve pounds of specie for their services, paid in useful tools and other items to them. Others were specifically slated to be "sold" in Pittsburgh newspapers. The ability of Hutton to dictate selling in a Pennsylvania newspapers shows how the market for unfree labor remained strong.[68]

Conversely, the work provided by "a negro girl" for Robert Ayres shows that informal systems of labor outside of the regular labor economy were possible, and probably common, particularly among families that owned multiple slaves. While slave hiring was an important business for slaveowners in middle Appalachia, the role of slaves in working families' and their owners' plots provided important labor for development, particularly when paired with the increasingly supply of free labor in the towns of middle Appalachia.[69]

---

[68] Will of Margaret Hutton, December 7, 1796. Ancestry.com. *Pennsylvania, Wills and Probate Records, 1683-1993* [database on-line]. Provo, UT, USA: Ancestry.com Operations, Inc., 2015.

[69] Diary of Robert Ayres, 1788-1790. Folder 4, Papers of Robert Ayres, 1785-1837.

It was in the 1790s that advertisements for both slave sales and slave runaways began to appear in middle Appalachia also. With increasing frequency, slave ads, particularly for estates being sold off, are offering slaves (both single and in small units) for sale. African Americans are also apparently seeing the opportunity of a border nearby as advertisements for fugitives begin to appear not just in Pittsburgh but all along the Pennsylvania border (where newspapers existed) and even in Maryland, with advertisements from Virginia and local slaveholders prominent there.[70]

The use of unfree labor had social, political, and economic ramifications on middle Appalachia as a region and borderlands, as new people and those of different races were incorporated into the region. As Jonathan Martin has shown, "slave hiring…facilitated westward migration by making it easier for small and large slaveholders to pursue" economic opportunities and it "ushered many more white Southerners into the slaveholding ranks than would have been possible" if slave purchasing was necessary.[71] Socially and politically this is important as it allowed for widespread use of slavery without the institution itself being widespread. This is even more important when considering that a relatively insignificant amount of people actually held slaves in Pennsylvanian middle Appalachia (as compared with about twenty percent in Maryland middle Appalachia).[72]

---

[70] Newspaper advertisements for slaves for slave are common in southern Pennsylvania and western Maryland during the 1790s. An example of this is one advertised For Sale, A stout healthy Negro Woman, a slave for life—most excellent Cook and acquainted with all kinds of house work—very suitable for the Country. Apply to the Printer for further particulars. April 24, 1799. Advertisement, "For Sale" *Oracle of Dauphin and Harrisburgh Advertiser* April 24, 1799.

[71] Jonathan Martin, *Divided Mastery: Slave Hiring in the American Mountain South* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004), 2.

[72] Total Population Density, 1790. Social Explorer, https://www.socialexplorer.com/a9676d974c/explore; Total Population Density, 1800. Social Explorer, https://www.socialexplorer.com/a9676d974c/explore; Dunaway, *Slavery in the American Mountain South*, 25.

The uses of slave hiring (or slave borrowing in the case of Robert Ayres and the young black girl) allowed these agricultural producers to enter the capitalist market in three ways. First, by allowing families like the Ayres to produce subsistence agriculture to feed themselves and any laborers (free and unfree) that they hired. Second, by allowing the production of grains and meats (and in the case of the Ayres, sugar cane and molasses) for small-scale market consumption). Finally, it allowed for the cultivation of cash crops and the production of extractive resources for the market. Just as importantly, slaveholders were also able to monopolize positions in the local economies and societies because of the economic success and access to capital outside of what is available in land. [73]

The final issue is the importance of women in the development of capitalism in middle Appalachia. Women were important not only in the responsibilities that are typical for women but also in the aid they provide by producing surplus goods for the market. In middle Appalachia, this model of women's labor is confirmed, with women contributing to the production of surplus goods, providing agricultural labor, and, of course, bearing children and household maintenance. Unfortunately, there is very little evidence of what precisely the life of upper-class women like Margaret Hutton or middle class women like Rachel Goe, speaking nothing of lower class, working women, were like in middle Appalachia. Aside from mentions of Rachel going to town, or visits from Margaret, the activities of the women of middle Appalachia are relatively unknown. Historians have emphasized in recent years, however, the importance of women to the frontier, capitalist economy as producers, managers, and laborers in the home economy.[74]

---

[73] Dunaway, *Slavery in the American Mountain South*, 33, 37.

[74] I draw upon the following for my understanding of women in economic production and capitalist development: Dunaway, *The First American Frontier*, 117-119; Christopher Clark, *The Roots of Rural Capitalism: Western*

Women's class had a large impact on what their social and economic activities entailed. Women were, as Dunaway argues, "the last link in a chain of exploitation" whose economic activities were as important as their ability to have children, which would themselves provide valuable labor. Moreover, for lower-class women, "women's work" was largely invisible but no less important. Historians, like Seth Rockman in his study of Baltimore, have shown that women often worked for wages if supporting their family was in the balance. In rural areas, however, it is much more difficult but much of their work was "unpaid or paid only indirectly through male intermediaries as heads of households."[75]

Women's roles in the rural household included "storing and preparing food, making and mending clothing" and of course to having and raising children.[76] All of these duties were essential to maintaining the household and children were also an important source of labor. The nature of the patriarchal household in middle Appalachia reflects the nonegalitarian nature of family life but also the overriding importance placed on men's work. In Clark's study of the Connecticut Valley, women's work was valued at only a third or half that of men's work.[77]

Children's labor also came in other form aside from working their parent's property. In middle Appalachia, Orphan's Courts were able to fill labor gaps. Orphans, illegitimate children, or children of vagrants or those adults in poorhouses, were apprenticed to farmers and artisans

---

Massachusetts, 1780-1860 (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1992), 142-146; Rockman, *Scraping By*, 100-132; Ellen Hartigan-O'Connor, "Gender's Value in the History of Capitalism" *Journal of the Early Republic* 36, no. 4 (Winter 2016): 613-635; and Jeanne Boydston, "The Woman Who Wasn't There: Women's Market Labor and the Transition to Capitalism in the United States," in *The Journal of the Early Republic* 16, no. 2 (Summer 1996):183-206.

[75] Dunaway, *The First American Frontier*, 117; Rockman, *Scraping By*, 102-117.

[76] Clark, *The Roots of Rural Capitalism*, 24.

[77] Ibid., 25.

until they reached the age of eighteen or twenty-one. In the western Maryland Orphans Court, for instance, apprenticed children for fourteen years to local artisans and importantly, the men who sat on these courts were oftentimes themselves important economic actors in the communities, some slaveholders, who both needed and understood the needs for slaves.[78]

In addition to agricultural products, the Mid-Atlantic States produced large quantities of iron ore and processed that into iron during the colonial and Revolutionary period, representing another industry where slave and free labor intermingled. The struggles of all states to manufacture arms and equipment was represented in both Maryland and Pennsylvania as both states' legislatures worked to develop those industries during the Revolutionary War. By 1775, Maryland (along with Virginia) operated about a quarter of furnaces and forges while Pennsylvania had one quarter by itself.[79] The Chesapeake economy was especially suited for this type of industry due to the seasonal nature of tobacco, regular shipments to and from England, and the readily available labor. Combined with the readily available iron ore, timber for charcoal and coal, and water resources allowed for thirty-six ironworks to be erected in Maryland.[80]

In 1790, William Turnbull and Peter Marmie, who worked in Pittsburgh and Philadelphia as merchants respectively, began construction on the Alliance Iron Works in Fayette County, Pennsylvania. Along with investor John Holker, who originally was a French envoy tasked with purchasing supplies from American ports for French ships, the construction of the forge went as planned and it first was blown on November 1, 1790. The combination of these three men gives

[78] Dunaway, *The First American Frontier*, 113.

[79] Lewis, *Coal, Iron, and Slaves: Industrial Slavery in Maryland and Virginia, 1715-1865* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1979), 11-12.

[80] Ibid., 12.

evidence that the transition of middle Appalachia is being effected by both those in the region and outside actors, as they are investing in the region, producing a new working class, and creating economic connections that firmly established middle Appalachia into regional and national economic structures by the early nineteenth century.[81]

Beginning in 1788, the partners began to search for supplies for what became the Alliance Iron Works. The partners designed the ironworks as a fully operational industrial complex. Local extractive resources, such as coal, iron, and timber along with available water resources, allowed for these extravagant plans. These plans consistently met with problems of sourcing supplies, finding workmen, and completing the complex. In 1788, Holker wrote of his ability to find "a very clever man to attend the digging of ore, who will have under his care 12, 15, or 20 hands according as I find I shall comply in making up their Wages." Finding workers was difficult but finding the resources appeared even more difficult, for when he was "fortunately met with Twenty barrels of flower at red Stone [Redstone, Pennsylvania]" for which he was forced to "give Eight dollars [per] barrel and a very great favor to get more than ten barrels…"[82] Finally, in 1791, he shows how extensive early extractive and processing industries could be when he spoke of when the "Saw Mill giving away" which was a "very great draw back" but that "alterations in the furnace wheel" would help processing of iron ore. He also speaks of a coal house constructed on the property and that houses were being constructed for the workers.[83]

---

[81] Solon J. Buck and Elizabeth Hawthorn Buck, *The Planting of Civilization in Western Pennsylvania* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1968), 304.

[82] Turnbull to Holker Pittsburgh September 24th. 1788; Turnbull to Holker Pittsburgh May 15th 1790 Folder 2. John Holker Papers 1770-1814

[83] Turnbull to Holker Pittsburgh Decr. 12th 1791. Folder 2. John Holker Papers 1770-1814

Holker also discusses the problems of operated a business that requires an interstate workforce and resource base. In 1792, Turnbull wrote to Holker discussing plans for Col. Presley Nevil who wished to move closer to the ironworks as either a manager or investor. The problem was that Nevil owned property and slaves in Virginia, which he would have to dispose of because "he cannot bring such property to this state." Turnbull hoped that Holker, who was an investor in land in the region, was interested in purchasing the property so that Nevil could make his move to Pennsylvania.[84]

By 1793, Turnbull visited the ironworks, he "found the furnace working well," which showed potential in the region but not security. While he was pleased with the manager of the furnace because he was a "smart, active attentive man" and he "understands his business well." Unfortunately the issues of supplies, not just of material but also labor, had not yet went away because the "stock of ore" was "very low, the furnace consuming eight and ten tons in the Twenty-four hours, and the bank yielding only four and five tons with all the hands Mr. Marmie could get." He also discusses the problems that the people of middle Appalachia faced because the company was forced to "open a road" which he stayed until "it was finished and a Bridge thrown over the creek and ore hawld" back before he left. Importantly, he "got the assistance of some of the neighbors who very chearfully came which enabled us to get it done so soon."[85]

For a variety of reasons, the issues facing the Alliance Iron Works and the investors that created show how middle Appalachia changed during the transitional period in the 1790s. New professions appeared, the population grew, and capitalist market relations were created not just in agriculture but also in industry. Moreover, Baltimorean and Philadelphian merchants and

[84] Pittsburgh June 29th 1792, Turnbull to Holker. Folder 2. John Holker Papers 1770-1814

[85] Pittsburgh 15 Feb. 1793, Turnbull to Holker. Folder 2. John Holker Papers 1770-1814

their constituent legislatures competed for control of the hinterlands, with Pittsburgh merchants, represented by Holker, entering into the competition. Middle Appalachia was ground zero for this industry in the late eighteenth century as the waterways, particularly those that led to Pittsburgh (which saw construction of the first ironworks in 1789) and the enormous supply of ores and coal ensured that the iron industry became pervasive. Particularly in western Maryland, Cumberland the surrounding regions contained the richest coal and iron deposits in Maryland.[86] Ready supply of labor was critical to industrial development and as middle Appalachia grew, industrial development grew. In the 1790s, Isaac Weld, Jr., toured the Chesapeake and noted that "the forges and furnaces are all worked by negroes, who seem to be particularly suited to such an occupation."[87]

Just as importantly, for many iron manufacturers in the Chesapeake, an interracial workforce was the norm. In Maryland, the expansion of the industrial base was not built upon free labor of slaves alone but also by cheap labor supplied by European immigrants, particularly in the nineteenth century. In middle Appalachia, slave labor was less used than immigrant labor for mining and industrial work but the likelihood of slave use, particularly in Maryland, is very high. In the late eighteenth and first two decades of the nineteenth century, however, mining for coal generally was for domestic purposes for farmers and townspeople. In the nineteenth century, organized mining companies formed in middle Appalachia that took advantage of the enormous coalfields.[88]

[86] Lewis, *Coal, Iron, and Slaves*, 16.

[87] As quoted in Lewis, *Coal, Iron, and Slaves*, 20.

[88] Ibid., 47; Dunaway, *Slavery in the American Mountain South*, 113.

In the 1790s, plantations in western Maryland followed a trend throughout southern Appalachia- they began to industrialize. A trend that became much more prominent in the nineteenth century, they often used slaves for traditional agricultural work alongside extractive industries. In western Maryland this was not as prominent as in the rest of middle Appalachia, making that region distinctly middle Appalachian in nature, but was still a critical facet of plantation labor. Combine that with the use of slave labor by industrialists, for instance in 1796 the Cumberland Forge employed forty-four slaves, capitalism became pervasive in dictating both the use of slaves and the needs to maintain profitability in middle Appalachia.[89]

Before the advent of major coal mining operations, farmers used their off-seasons to dig for coal and gathered it near Cumberland on the Potomac River. Once the water levels rose high enough, a fleet of "coal-arks", or flatbed boats would load the material and make the treacherous journey from Cumberland. Only estimations of how much coal was transported, with some records suggesting it in the thousands of tons but this was a community events, celebrations were held in Cumberland when the fleet departed.[90] This fleet, which began this yearly tradition in the 1790s, shows how integrated middle Appalachia was becoming in the capitalist market relations forming across the United States. The importance of seasonal mining, like other industrial activities done by farmers during their off-season, is important to understanding how capitalist relations in middle Appalachia operated and how these connections were being formed beyond agricultural production.

The capitalist connections represented by farmers mining coal in their off-season are also those that are present for the construction of the Alliance Iron Works in Fayette County; capital,

[89] Dunaway, *Slavery in the American Mountain South*, 128.

[90] Ibid., 48.

labor, and resources combined to create new capitalist modes of labor. Much like in agricultural work, slave hiring was also common in extractive and industrial work. More so than in agricultural work, however, in industrial work there was a "divorce of management and ownership in slave-hiring [which] produced serious conflicts between masters and employers."[91] The divorce between owner and employer gave some room for slaves to maneuver and gain advantages. From less strict discipline, for fear of owners losing their access to slave labor, to the ability to negotiate better employment conditions, slaves were able to exercise more power.[92]

Race was also an important aspect in these extractive and manufacturing industries because the need for labor often forced employers to overlook, although not ignore, the race of their employees; it also provided the necessity for mixed-labor worksites. The need for labor driven by growing capitalist market connections and the mistrust of free whites, particularly artisans, who have freedom of movement, means that managers and owners turned unfree laborers when it was available. In middle Appalachia, this opportunity was circumscribed because of the lower numbers of officially unfree laborers there but was still used when available. Thus, employers were, when able, glad to mix racially their labor force and to rely on free and unfree labor when they could.[93]

Slavery, wage laboring, and access to resources and land all contributed to the understanding of race and class in middle Appalachia. Poor whites both benefitted and helped sustain slavery and the racial system in their communities. The competition for employment, the

[91] Ibid., 85.

[92] Ibid., 88; Jonathan D. Martin, *Divided Mastery: Slave Hiring in the American South* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004), 105-6.

[93] John Bezis-Selfa, "A Tale of Two Ironworks: Slavery, Free Labor, Work, and Resistance in the Early Republic" in *The William and Mary Quarterly* 56, no. 4 (October 1999), 679.

frustration felt by poor whites to their black counterparts, and the economic success of some black families encouraged this system, prompted by the racism that developed in the colonial period.[94]

On an interpersonal level, it appears that working relations were good between white and black laborers. No doubt there was resentment and contempt on both sides but that "loathing coexisted with friendship." Indeed, slaves and poor whites also developed bonds, despite or perhaps because of the reputation of poor whites for laziness and the assumption that they were too proud to perform "nigger work", they oftentimes worked side-by-side for agricultural work.[95] One slave recalls a time when harvesting was a communal event and the "tenant wives and slave women would gather at the "big house"…and cook the midday meal for the work hands." Communal labor, therefore, worked on an interpersonal level, particularly at times when large amounts of labor were required.[96]

The utilization of different forms of labor is important for understanding middle Appalachia in both regional and national trends. Unlike in the rest of southern Appalachia, western Maryland industrialized at a much more rapid pace, joining the Pennsylvania part of middle Appalachia. Indeed, western Maryland industrialized and capitalized at a pace one and a half times that of the rest of southern Appalachia and extractive industries formed the critical foundation of this industrial development.[97]

---

[94] Dunaway, *Slavery in the American Mountain South*, 147.

[95] Jeff Foret, *Race Relations at the Margins: Slaves and Poor Whites in the Antebellum Southern Countryside* (Baton Rouge, LA: LSU Press, 2006), 24-28.

[96] Dunaway, *Slavery in the American Mountain South*, 147.

[97] Dunaway, *The First American Frontier*, 157-164.

Middle Appalachia provided resources for three different markets: local consumers, regional towns and merchants, and distant markets. For middle Appalachia, the primary destination for extractive industrial goods was Baltimore and Pittsburgh, as most transportation routes were directed into those two cities (although infrastructure development in the nineteenth century changed these dynamics). Most of middle Appalachia's production of coal and ores was oriented to external sources, although in the nineteenth century firms were consuming it locally (plus the domestic consumption of coal).[98]

The role of middle Appalachia in fueling industrial development outside of middle Appalachia supports the argument of Wilma Dunaway that this region is peripheral capitalist zone. Importantly, however, residents of middle Appalachia are deeply involved in terms of agricultural, extractive, and processing industries. Those in the middle class, like Robert Ayres, and those in the upper class, like Albert Gallatin and William Turnbull, are consciously making the decisions to begin integration of the middle Appalachian economy. To do so, they are exploiting labor provided by the lower classes. The lower classes in the 1790s are predominantly white but African Americans are also entering the region, primarily as slaves in the 1780s and 1790s, but increasingly as both free members of society (although still constrained by racial and economic barriers) and as fugitives escaping from southern border states. Middle Appalachia was increasingly home to major arteries of the Underground Railroad, on display as the implications of a borderland become increasingly apparent to the residents.

In 1790, for instance, in response to a petition from the people of Washington County, Maryland, the Maryland legislature passed a measure to build a road that connects the ironworks at Antietam, on the Potomac River, to Fredericktown, in Frederick County. The people sent this

[98] Ibid., 165-66.

petition to the state legislature to ensure that arteries are opened for their agricultural produce but is a way for Maryland to ensure connections are made to other critical resources produced in middle Appalachia. The processing industries, such as ironworks, mills, and transportation industries, such as ferries, are all important for the creation of these economic capitalist connections and show that middle Appalachia is a region that is developing a mixed economy.[99]

Beginning in 1788, Allegany County, Maryland, developed as the region in which Maryland Revolutionary war veterans received land. By allowing veterans access to lands "west of Fort Cumberland" (which at the time was part of Washington County), Maryland triggered two developments: first, small farmsteads became the norm in western Maryland, a truism for all of middle Appalachia; and second, speculators, who were already interested in the region, were able to then buy up lands from these veterans. The latter issue was one that was prominent throughout the United States and an issue that was consistently dealt with in all states.[100]

Throughout the 1780s, the Confederation Congress was desperate to raise funds and the most promising way to do this, and only mechanism aside from relying on the states, were land sales. While the Congress wanted to attract good settlers, those that would settle and become productive citizens, squatters consistently ruined these plans, particularly when it came to maintaining peace with the Indians. Frustrated, and needing cash, the Congress allowed speculators to buy land, and they did so expecting to make a tidy profit by selling the land to settlers in the most desirable area. Aside from veterans, who were provided land, speculators

[99] "An Act to open a road from Swearingen's ferry, on Patowmack river, to Washington county, to the iron-works and mills at the mouth of the Anti-eatem, and from thence into the main road leading to Fredericktown, in Frederick county (1790)" in William Kilty, *The laws of Maryland: to which are prefixed the original charter…*, 1501. Early State Records Online, *Maryland State Archives*, MSA SC M 3150, p. 1583.

[100] "An Act to dispose of the reserved lands westward of Fort Cumberland, in Washington county, and to fulfil the engagements made by this state to the officers and soldiers of the Maryland line in service of the United States" in William Kilty, *The laws of Maryland: to which are prefixed the original charter…*

owned the most land and were also the most frustrated, as squatters often settled despite ownership and developed the land. Western lands continued to be an issue for the federal government into the antebellum period; the issue of veteran lands was never truly settled.[101]

This forced Maryland to deal with settlers who had trouble financing these land sales. Indeed, in 1790, the state was forced to extend the time required for land payments because of the "inconvenient time of the year."[102] The legislature, not making the money they thought they would, were forced in 1792, to set a specific time because payments were not forthcoming. [103] Just as importantly, as both settlers and speculators arrived in Allegany County, the state legislature was then forced to send a commission to the county to help establish land disputes, an issue that plagued the western parts of every state.[104]

In addition, Maryland was forced to work on infrastructure to these western lands which created capitalist connections by linking towns with agricultural lands. Throughout the 1790s the legislature worked to integrate Allegany County into Baltimore's orbit. In 1793, for instance, the legislature passed an act to open two roads in Allegany County which connected with roads in Virginia. This is important because with roads that were established in Allegany County led to Cumberland, then east to towns, eventually leading to Baltimore.[105] The legislature also worked to build connections into Pennsylvania in 1794 by improving a road that extended from

[101] Wood, *Empire of Liberty*, 116-118.

[102] "An Act respecting the settlers on the reserved lands westward of Fort Cumberland" in William Kilty, *The laws of Maryland: to which are prefixed the original charter…*

[103] "A Further supplement to an act respecting the settlers on the reserved lands westward of Fort Cumberland" in William Kilty, *The laws of Maryland: to which are prefixed the original charter…*

[104] "A Further supplement to the act respecting the settlers on the reserved lands westward of Fort Cumberland" in William Kilty, *The laws of Maryland: to which are prefixed the original charter…*

[105] "An Act to lay off and open two roads in Allegany county" in William Kilty, *The laws of Maryland: to which are prefixed the original charter…*

Cumberland to Uniontown in Fayette County, Pennsylvania. The reason for this is because "it appearing to this general assembly that the same will be of considerable advantage to this state, by opening a better communication with the western country…"[106] Much like the road from Antietam to Frederickstown, western agitated for these improvements. As much as it would help secure the economic connections of middle Appalachia for Baltimore (and the same attempts were made in Pennsylvania), it benefitted occupants of middle Appalachia who accessed these markets and used them for their own gains. These improvements cut across party lines also as western representatives in both states block-voted for these improvements.

With these improvements, middle Appalachia became ever more attractive to investors because there was a ready and reliable transportation route through the region. Although roads were more expensive and slower, it presaged the development of canals, and later railroads that extended into middle Appalachia in the antebellum period. These investors, who often doubled as speculators, as much as the local upper and middle class, that developed a labor system predicated upon the use of unfree and free labor which included both blacks and whites. The labor market of middle Appalachia was emblematic of the transformations occurring throughout the nation and middle Appalachia's integration into the broader national and international markets created opportunities for "artisans and farmers cobbled together workforces that included apprentices, indentured servants, slaves, tenants, and wage laborers."[107]

The 1790s was a transitional period for middle Appalachia and the United States as a whole. The continued growth of agriculture and the increasing of both extractive and processing

[106] "An Act for straightening and amending the road from the town of Cumberland, in Allegany county, which intersects the road leading from Union-town, in Pennsylvania, at the Winding bridge" in William Kilty, *The laws of Maryland: to which are prefixed the original charter…*

[107] Max Grivno, *Gleanings of Freedom: Free and Slave Labor along the Mason-Dixon Line, 1790-1860*, 36.

industries exemplifies these changes and continues to increase the demand in middle Appalachia for labor. The stories of Robert Ayres and Margaret Hutton shows how free and unfree labor developed alongside increasing social stratification in middle Appalachia. The definition of a lower, middle, and upper class was created during the 1790s and effected political and social conflict in the region, giving insight into national trends.

The growth of an African American community also began in the 1790s, one that would make meaningful strides in both economic and social development in the nineteenth. They would not have been able to make these strides, however, without the establishment of independent households that increasingly grew into sources of labor, both skilled and unskilled. This African American community became magnets for fugitives who escaped along the Underground Railroad in the 1790s, increasing the size of the African American community itself and the conflict that community caused.

Finally, capitalism came to dominate local, regional, and national connections during this period. Not only is the competition between Baltimore, Pittsburgh, and Philadelphia seen in the 1790s with investors, speculators, and settlers seeking middle Appalachia resources, but also local actors forcing actions by state governments. The construction of roads, bridges, and ferries in middle Appalachia allows for the region to become further enmeshed in the national and international economies. It also sets the tone for further integration by both state and national governments in the nineteenth century.

Chapter 5
"Esteemed equal if not superior": Integration of Middle Appalachia into National Markets and Politics, 1800-1840

The antebellum period in middle Appalachia saw the full development of capitalist market relations stimulated by both infrastructure construction, the growth of slavery and the continuation of unfree labor, the hardening of the border, the growth of the Underground Railroad, and proliferation of the free black community in the North. From 1800 until 1840, middle Appalachia became more incorporated in regional, state, and national markets than ever before. Because of this, political and social relations in the region began to mirror that of other borderland regions across the United States. The slow death of slavery in Pennsylvania only aggravated the issue; as Pennsylvanians helped slaves escape while also having unfree laborers working in their communities, particularly in middle Appalachia.

The growth of infrastructure and stimulation of capitalist market relations took many forms in middle Appalachia. The earliest and most important of these was the National Road, a road that connected Cumberland, Maryland to Wheeling, Virginia and eventually spread from Baltimore to Vandalia, Illinois. The road was a highway of commerce, an avenue for settlement in the new western states, and even an artery in the Second Middle Passage that dominated antebellum slave markets. The growth of slavery in middle Appalachia speaks to the westward movement of slavery. Western Maryland saw a steady increase in slaves until the 1830s and no serious decline after that. Even in southwestern Pennsylvania, census enumerators even saw an increase in slavery. Albeit through a mistake of counting, their confusion illustrates that unfree labor continued throughout the antebellum period in Pennsylvania.

By the 1820s and 1830s, infrastructure included both canals and railroads, further integrating middle Appalachia into regional and national markets. The growth of both

agriculture and industry during these decades is indicative of both outside investments in the region and ready access to labor, capital, and transportation to move goods. Labor relations in the region were strained, particularly on large worksites, but also on plantations and among small farmers. Full integration in national markets and politics brought issues of their own, whether over slavery, ethnic issues on multicultural sites, and even labor agitation. The issues, specifically over slavery and fugitive slaves, industrial and agricultural development, infrastructure improvements, and borderland social and political tensions, were all stimulated by integration.

In March 1801, when Thomas Jefferson was sworn into office as president, there were still only two major roads for travel west in the Mid-Atlantic States. Both dated from the time of the French and Indian War and both were designed to access the Ohio River Valley through middle Appalachia. Braddock's Road, which connected Virginia to the Pittsburgh region, was an artifact of the first attempt to take Fort Duquesne; Forbes' Road, which linked Philadelphia with Pittsburgh, dated from the successful capture of Fort Duquesne.[1]

In the ensuing decades, little work was done on either road. During the 1790s, Pennsylvania began to renovate Forbes' Road into a state toll road but Braddock's Road had fallen into disuse, particularly in western Virginia. The construction of a national east-west road was not only based on the successful north-south road that ran from Maine to Georgia for the post but also on the "Great Highway of Pennsylvania." Forbes' Road, or the "Great Highway," was perhaps the "more important artery of national life than was controlled by any other state."[2]

[1] Joseph S. Wood, "The Idea of the National Road" in *The National Road* ed. Karl B. Raitz (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1996), 100.

[2] Ibid., 102. Quoted is located on same page.

The desire for economic connections into the Ohio River Valley, which dated from the late colonial period, intensified after independence, especially once Indians in the region were defeated and more settlers moved there. Middle Appalachia was constantly the site of designs for infrastructure improvements that not only would facilitate travel and settlement but also secure economic connections to various metropoles, depending on the time and place of the planners. Both Pennsylvania's and Maryland's legislature was involved in building roads and securing these economic connections largely to established state authority over a lightly-settled region but also because locals wanted and needed these connections for their economic livelihood.[3]

The desire for a waterway to provide just such a connection was forefront in George Washington's imagination of the region and Virginians especially wanted this. The various canal schemes ultimately were fruitless but the move to connect these economic hinterlands was a goal that state officials and capitalists consistently worked for in the nineteenth century. In the early 1780s, the Maryland legislature began to investigate the cost of building a canal that would connect the Potomac with the tidewater; by 1785, both Maryland and Virginia chartered the Potomac Company to plan and construct the canal. For the next twenty years, the Potomac Company worked to build locks and tributaries that created water connections between the Potomac and the tidewater but fell short of definite connections to the Ohio River Valley.[4]

[3] George Washington's interest in the region is an excellent microcosm of this trend. See John Lauritz Larson, *Internal Improvements: National Public Works and the Promise of Popular Government in the Early United States* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2001), 10-12; Ron Chernow, *Washington: A Life* (New York: The Penguin Press, 2010), 479-482.

[4] Dan Guzy, *Navigation on the Upper Potomac River and Its Tributaries*, Second Edition (Online: WHILBR, 2011), http://www.whilbr.org/assets/uploads/NavigationOnTheUpperPotomac.pdf (accessed 9/24/2017), 9-12.

It was also in the 1780s and 1790s that concerns about the lack of national unity began to turn nationalists' attentions to internal improvement projects that linked east and west. Many Federalists, and later National Republicans, saw infrastructure as the best means to link east and west and to secure national unity through economic connections and cooperation. This was especially important as more western states joined the union, especially Ohio in 1802. Just as importantly, the debate over funding and the national government often turned on local and state interests as much as truly national or constitutional debates.[5]

When, in 1806, Jefferson approved a new law for the Cumberland Road he was actually signing off on a process of negotiation and contention about both the role of the federal government in creating nationality and the fight between Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania over where the road should go. Moreover, the symbolism of the road was important for it was designed not only as a conduit for settlers and economic life but also a "search for union."[6]

Couched in the language of national unity and strengthening the bonds of the market was the intent to create capitalist market relations that envelope the new western territories and states. The congressional committee, in reporting the bill, said that "important considerations of cementing the Union of our citizens located on the western waters with those of the Atlantic States" was the most important goal of building the road. Indeed, "to make the crooked ways straight, and the rough ways smooth will, in effect, remove the intervening mountains, and by facilitating the intercourse of our western brethren with those of the Atlantic, substantially unite them in purpose."[7]

---

[5] Wood, "The Idea of a National Road," 113; Larson, *Internal Improvements,* 55-56.

[6] Thomas and Williams, *A History of Allegany County,* 181; Wood, "The Idea of a National Road", 103.

[7] Reported quoted in Thomas and Williams, *History of Allegany County*, 181-182.

There were two issues confronting those who wished to construct a national road: location and financing. First was the location of the road with three states wanting it, especially Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia. Second was funding for the road. The cost was expected to be larger than almost any other project before to both construct and maintain the road. The creation of the state of Ohio (1802) was both an impetus for and a means by which state and federal authorities designed and constructed roads in territories. As part of the act admitting the state, Congress created a fund specifically for road creation that allocated five percent of land sales, two percent of which were designed specifically for roads that led to Ohio. This program for infrastructure development continued with the later admission of Indian and Illinois.[8]

Congress chose the road's path through sectional compromise between Federalists and Republicans and Virginians and Pennsylvanians. The congressional committee considered three paths: from Philadelphia via Pittsburgh (Forbes' Road), from Baltimore to the Potomac, and from Richmond into western Virginia near the James and Kanawha Rivers. Ultimately, they chose a path that went through Cumberland, Maryland because there was already a toll road under construction in Pennsylvania along Forbes' Road funded by the state while the path through Virginia that the road there would take was too lightly settled.[9]

The road between Cumberland, Maryland and Wheeling, Virginia, was the first section constructed of what became the National Road. For Allegany County, the road was a positive development for two reasons: first, the town of Cumberland was growing quickly and becoming an economic center. During the 1790s the town hosted a weekly market and early inhabitants not only commented on the natural beauty of the region, some hopefully calling it "queen city"

[8] Thomas and Williams, *A History of Allegany County*., 182; Larson, *Internal Improvements*, 55.

[9] Larson, *Internal Improvements*, 55.

but they also understood that the town could provide a valuable portal to Ohio, linking Baltimore with the markets not only in middle Appalachia but also linking it to the expanding settlement of Ohio. Second, the road spurred westward development as the early nineteenth century saw a veritable flood of migrants into the newly opened territories in the northwest; many of those migrants moved through middle Appalachia, specifically Cumberland.[10]

The National Road was later incorporated into a much larger plan of national infrastructure that Albert Gallatin, Jefferson's Secretary of the Treasury, proposed in 1808. Predicated on the final payoff of the national debt, the continuation of peace for the United States, and revenues from trade, Gallatin proposed a system of infrastructure, consisting of roads and canals, which would link the United States into a national market. The system proposed would create canals on the east coast that connected Massachusetts with Georgia and included four turnpikes, based on the National (or Cumberland) Road, that crossed the Appalachian Mountains.[11]

The first part of the National Road was constructed between 1811 and 1816 and lived up to many of the expectations of the road. As one speaker said: "it carried thousands of population and millions of wealth into the West" and "served to harmonize and strengthen, if not save the Union." Gallatin, in a report to the Senate echoed this in saying that "no other single operation within the power of the Government can more effectually tend to strengthen and perpetuate the Union."[12]

---

[10] Brugger, *Maryland, A Middle Temperament*, 156.

[11] Albert Gallatin, "Report on Roads and Canals, April 6, 1808" in Ferguson, ed., *Selected Writings of Albert Gallatin*.

[12] Both are quotes from Thomas and Williams, *History of Allegany County*, 182.

The road connected middle Appalachia unlike any state project before by creating a highway of immigration and commerce connecting some of the main towns of middle Appalachia, including Cumberland, Maryland and Uniontown, Pennsylvania. It stretched from Hagerstown, Maryland to Wheeling, Virginia. Wheeling proved to be a gateway to Ohio that served as an important economic hub itself. By 1832, Maryland, in conjunction with federal authorities, had extended the road to Baltimore, giving a roughly straight path from that city to Ohio. The completion of the road succeeded in several ways: it allowed for increased migration west and it provided funds to the states through which it passed to construct further infrastructure by allowing the states to charge tolls. Finally, it created economic connections that were before a patchwork by the states.[13]

Just as importantly, the borderland nature of middle Appalachia was altered by the National Road. The Road crossed and roughly following the Mason-Dixon Line west as it began in Cumberland, passed into Pennsylvania and went through the northern neck of Virginia to Wheeling. As the road was constructed, Gallatin was able to route it through his own region of southwestern Pennsylvania while ensuring that the rivers, the Potomac and Monongahela especially, were connected by the Road. Moreover, both Maryland and Pennsylvania constructed linkages to the Road, ensuring that traffic to and from both Baltimore and Philadelphia would come across the road.[14]

The economic borderlands of capitalist market relations was fully integrated into the national economy by this road. Connections that were constructed by Pennsylvania and Maryland were connected and straightened by the National Road planning and the role of

[13] Thomas and Williams, *History of Allegany County,* 184.

[14] Wood, "The Idea of a National Road," 113.

infrastructure in creating market connections was an important goal of middle Appalachians dating from the American Revolution. It also changed it by altering the political dynamics of middle Appalachia; the political fights over internal improvements of the antebellum period were very important and had real meaning for the residents of the region.[15]

Beginning after the War of 1812 and continuing into the 1830s, the issue of internal improvements became one of constitutional limits on federal power. Ultimately, the arguments over the power of the federal government to build infrastructure transformed and join other issues, including banking and issues of currency in the creation of the second party system between the Whigs and the Democrats. To many in politics, the National Road itself would be a model either of a successful infrastructure project or of government overreach, notwithstanding the economic improvement that came with the national road.[16]

The road was not just important as a highway of settlement and commerce, it was also important to the institution of slavery. Thomas B. Seawright, in his history of the National Road written after the Civil War, said that "negro slaves were frequently seen on the National Road." Indeed, he had seen "them driven over the road arranged in couples and fastened to a long, thick rope or cable, like horses." While this "may seem incredible to a majority of persons" living then, "it is true, and was a very common sight in the early history of the road and evoked no expression of surprise, or words of censure."[17] The east-west nature of the National Road

---

[15] Wood, "The Idea of the National Road," 182-83; Larson, *Internal Improvements*, 56; Howe, *What Hath God Wrought: The Transformation of America, 1815-1848* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 211.

[16] Howe, *What Hath God Wrought*, 211-212. Howe shows that the National Road stimulated construction companies and rose land prices wherever it was built, giving increasing economic incentive, if not political will, for the construction of infrastructure across the states.

[17] Thomas B. Seawright, *The Old Pike: A History of the National Road* (Uniontown, PA: By Author, 1894), 109.

contributed to its' role in the slave trade as the demand for slaves increased in the west and the number of slaves for sale increased in the east.

The Road was also present in sectional struggles over slavery not just for the slave trade but also for the role it played in the Underground Railroad. The construction of the road covered much of the antebellum period, including periods of intense sectional fights over slavery. While the road followed an east-west course, parts of it were used to help fugitives, particularly once the road crossed into Pennsylvania. One example of the uses of the National Road for the Underground Railroad is Dr. Julius LeMoyne, an abolitionist doctor who settled in Washington County after he escaped the turmoil of the French Revolution. He and his son remained abolitionists, active in abolitionist politics and movements in both Pennsylvania and Ohio. Their house could house dozens of slaves at a time and was often considered a "haven for fugitives trying to escape bondage."[18]

By the 1830s, unfortunately, the road was in disrepair. The federal government and the legislatures of all six states through which the National Road passed made an agreement by which the states could maintain the road but they were also allowed to charge tolls on the road. Such a compromise kept the road open and relatively well-maintained but not the most prominent infrastructure feature of middle Appalachia. What is critical about this is the stimulus for capitalist market relations and the development of new industries in in the regions through which the road passed.[19]

---

[18] Theodore Sky, *The National Road and the Difficult Path to Sustainable National Investment* (Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 2011), 131-132; Quote in Sky, *The National Road*, 132.

[19] Thomas and Williams, *History of Allegany County, 185*; Philip D. Jordon, *The National Road* (New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1948), 168-169; Searight, *The Old Pike,* 319-322.

The Napoleonic Wars, which ended in 1815, stimulated American agriculture and industry during the early republic. The demand in agricultural goods helped solidify the transition from monoculture to diversified crops in the Chesapeake and the continued settlement and planting of acres in the west. It is also the reason that men like Turnbull and Marmie felt that construction of a furnace and forge in Fayette County could be profitable. Although the market was there for American-produced iron, the ability to move goods to that market was limited in middle Appalachia until the construction of the National Road, and later canal and railroad improvements in the region. Through the 1790s, reports from the furnace consistently complained of supply issues and low productivity.[20]

The end of the Napoleonic War brought hard economic times in the United States, especially the mid-Atlantic. British products flooded the market, depressing industry in the region, agriculture in the region faced renewed competition from the European continental farmers, the tobacco market remained poor, and the West Indian trade was not only stagnant but American merchants had to content with renewed French and British trade there. After the War, Congress began to invest in internal improvements, created the Second Bank of the United States, and began protectionist parties that began to revive nationalist (formerly Federalist) fortunes in Maryland and Pennsylvania. Maryland especially benefited from the National Road in the west and a strong navy relying on Baltimore in the east.[21]

The Panic of 1819 hit Baltimore especially hard, and the grain and flour industry was hurt by the credit crunch of the panic years. Moreover, increased competition by other eastern port cities, such as New York which began construction of the Erie Canal in 1817, made troubles

[20] Turnbull to Holker, 15 February, 1793. Folder 2, Holker Papers.

[21] Brugger, *Maryland, A Middle Temperament*, 196.

even worse. The Panic of 1819, which caused a collapse in available credit, stimulating foreclosures and bankruptcies, was especially difficult on the Mid-Atlantic States. Both industry and agriculture was hurt; bank collapses, caused by over lending on land and an undersupply of specie, created an impetus of Congress to lower land prices while also ending the credit system for selling land, forcing potential buyers to rely on the private sector.[22]

By the 1820s, commercial competition with Philadelphia and New York stimulated further infrastructure development in Maryland, particularly canals and railroads. In the 1820s and 1830s, the state (and Baltimore) invested heavily in canal and railroad construction. The Potomac Company, though heavily in debt by the 1820s, was given more money to construction canals linking western Maryland to the east. Moreover, in 1824, Maryland, Delaware, and Pennsylvania jointly invested in a canal that linked the Delaware River with the Chesapeake; the Chesapeake and Delaware Company was forced to compete with the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Company, which was commissioned by Virginia and Maryland in 1824 also. The struggle for these two companies over financing aggravated preexisting sectional tensions in Maryland. Western Marylanders, including in middle Appalachia, supported the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Company, which would run through their region and provide reliable water transportation; they were able to make alliance with some easterners to make this happen by promising river dredging and other internal improvement projects.[23]

The political fights over internal improvements and the economic stimuli for them was created by a quickly industrializing mid-Atlantic. The mid-Atlantic was traditionally an

---

[22] John Lauritz Larson, *The Market Revolution in America: Liberty, Ambition, and the Eclipse of the Common Good* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 39-45. My understanding the 1819 Panic is also drawn from Charles Sellers, *The Market Revolution: Jacksonian America, 1815-1846* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), esp. Chapter 3 "The Crisis of 1819" and Howe, *What Hath God Wrought*, 142-147.

[23] Brugger, *Maryland: A Middle Temperament*, 202-3.

industrial area, with Pennsylvania and Maryland exporting industrial goods before processing plants were constructed. During the 1790s, large and small firms were created, like the Alliance Iron Works in middle Appalachia. While the economic difficulties of the early nineteenth century doomed many attempts, by the mid-nineteenth century the region was continuing the process of industrialization. Moreover, extractive industries also grew. Once constructed, the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal (which, despite its' name, did not reach the Ohio but rather ended at Cumberland, Maryland) was primarily used to transport coal from the region. Indeed, middle Appalachia became the site of both extractive and processing industries, both of which relied on the growing population of the region as important labor sources combined with the ability to gain access to markets and resources afforded by new infrastructure.[24]

The Alliance Iron Works stopped blasting by 1803 and Holker and his managers attempted to let the furnace to someone else. One of Holker's managers reported in 1806 that "surely the works produce no benefit at present and anything you can do with them is better than to be as they are." This is because between 1805 and 1807, as overproduction plagued the region, the value of the forge plummeted almost five hundred dollars. [25] In 1810, furthermore, his manager reported that "business of every kind is at stand, no trade, no cash, bad harvest this years."[26] While the Alliance Iron Works ultimately failed, it presaged the major extractive and processing industries that would succeed in the antebellum period.

---

[24] Brugger, *Marylan,: A Middle Temperament*, 205-6; Dunaway, *The First American Frontier*, 157-161.

[25] Holker Papers, Folder 2. For Quote, S. Hughes to Holker, Hagerstown 20 July 1806; for estimates on value of furnace, see Alliance Iron Works, Statement of Sundires, 1 October 1805 and Alliance Iron Works, 1 July 1807, Statement of Sundries, Holker Papers, Folder 2.

[26] Marmie to Holker, 5 February 1810. Holker Papers, Folder 2.

The 1820s also saw the first major mining companies to be chartered by the states in middle Appalachia. These companies were part of the corporatization of American business. State chartered corporations were critical to the expansion of capitalism in early America, they provided a means of freeing up capital without serious financial risks for investors. Thus, the corporate form of capitalism helped to market connections that included large industries and the industrialization of previously-marginalized areas, like middle Appalachia.[27]

One example of these forms of business was sent to the legislature in 1838 and details how these corporations planned their operations and how they could also be interstate (although they would have to be chartered in different states to operate there). A petition to create "The Mining, Manufacturing, and Railroad Company of Wellesly Manor" requested permission to begin mining coal and iron in Allegany County, Maryland and Bedford County, Pennsylvania, to construct a railroad for transportation that would transport both ore and processed materials "to many establishments that would be made, induced by the facility which a railroad would afford… to the Canal, and thereby add greatly to the revenue of that important improvement, as well as to the trade, and manufactures of the Towns lying intermediately and on the seaboard." The growth of business concerns like The Mining, Manufacturing, and Railroad Company of Wellesly Manor are endemic of business formation in the antebellum.[28]

While the Wellesly Manor plan was bold, and perhaps too large to fully implement all of the details, evidence suggests that businesses of all sizes could operate in middle Appalachia. One consistent complaint was remedied during the antebellum period for business ventures both

[27] Robert E. Wright, "Capitalism and the Rise of the Corporation Nation" in *Capitalism Takes Command: The Social Transformation of Nineteenth-Century America* edited by Michael Zakim and Gary J. Kornblith (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012), 145-147.

[28] Petition to Incorporate Mining, Manufacturing, and Railroad Company, 1838, Vertical File, Maryland Historical Society.

large and small, speaking to access to three things that middle Appalachians repeatedly requested from state authorities and complained about lack thereof: capital and currency, infrastructure improvements for access to markets, and labor. The chartering of the George's Creek Coal and Iron Company in 1836 is another example that was smaller in conception and far more successful. After buying a tract in Allegany County, the company's investors found that the land contained enough materials to more than pay for the investment amount and to be profitable.[29]

The company is important in examining how Appalachian resources were utilized by outside investors and how labor was organized on a large scale. In order to board both workers and contractors, the company constructed "shantees" that they could live in; a company town was part of the company for much of its operating history.[30] The company employed relatively few skilled workers, instead relying largely on unskilled workers using a method of mining that relied on surface exploitation rather than shaft digging. Importantly, the laborers used by the company were just as likely to be seasonal workers who also contributed to other business enterprises in the region. Indeed, the use of unskilled laborers was important in middle Appalachia, as in other regions, because it was available and cheap. Moreover, the company had workers that were somewhat experienced in this, as some of them were no doubt drawn from surrounding farms that practiced light mining in the off-season to supplement their agricultural income, a common practice in regions where coal was readily mined.[31]

---

[29]Dunaway, *The First American Frontier;* Katherine A. Harvey, ed., "The Lonaconing Journals: The Founding of a Coal and Iron Community, 1837-1840" in *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* New Series 67, no. 2 (1977), 9-10.

[30] Harvey, "The Lonaconing Journal," 14.

[31] Harvey, "The Lonaconing Journal," 19; Dunaway, *The First American Frontier,* 178-182; Lewis, *Coal, Iron, and Slaves,* 48.

The laborers at the worksite were composed of different nationalities, including Americans, Welsh, Germans, and even Native Americans. These groups often quarreled, slept in different shanties, and worked in different areas of the site. The Germans, apparently, were the most likely to strike from work for better working conditions. Both ethnic tensions and labor agitation were part of the antebellum landscape; especially visible in cities but present wherever large amounts of unskilled labor were needed and located. Indeed, the nineteenth century was a period of great immigration waves to the United States, primarily from Ireland and northern Europe. These groups provided cheap labor and were often utilized as such and also became the basis of party strength in the cities. They were also involved in the Workingmen's Parties of the 1830s and 1840s that began to agitate for higher wages, worker protection, and workplace reform.[32]

Thus, middle Appalachia's economy was diversifying in both terms of agricultural and industrial production but also the focus of outside investment with infrastructure and business. The reason that middle Appalachia transformed from a relative backwater in the 1790s into an important agricultural and extractive industrial (though not exclusively extractive) is because the region finally had access to major infrastructure improvements like roads, canals, and railroads; relatively easy credit; and access to markets. Indeed, the nineteenth century was a period when capitalist market relations fully crystallized in the United States and middle Appalachia alongside the hardening of slavery.

[32] Sean Wilentz, *Chants Democratic: New York City and the Rise of the American Working Class, 1788-1850* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 190-201; Sean Wilentz, *The Rise of American Democracy: Jefferson to Lincoln* (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 2005), 406-408, 720-722.

In 1849, James W. C. Pennington wrote a preface to his autobiography, detailing his escape from slavery and what his life in slavery was like, in which he asked "Why [have I] published anything so long after my escape from slavery?" to which he answered:

> I answer I have been induced to do so on account of the increasing disposition to overlook the fact, that THE SIN of slavery lies in the chattel principle, or relation… My feelings are always outraged when I hear them speak of "kind masters," "Christian masters," "the mildest form of slavery," "well fed and clothed slaves," as extenuations of slavery; I am satisfied they either mean to pervert the truth, or they do not know what they say. The being of slavery, its soul and body, lives and moves in the chattel principle, the property principle, the bill of sale principle; the cart-whip, starvation, and nakedness, are its inevitable consequences to a greater or less extend, warring with the dispositions of men.[33]

What Pennington calls the "chattel principle" was long a part of American slavery; indeed, the chattelization of slavery developed alongside the racialization of slavery in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. What occurred in nineteenth century United States, however, was an intensification of the chattel principle because of the growing cotton frontier in the southern states. The cotton South created the "migration generation" and was the beginning of a "second slavery" in the United States.[34]

The signature development of slavery in the nineteenth century was the internal slave trade from east to west, or the "Second Middle Passage." The second middle passage was the dominant feature of slavery in nineteenth century America and was stimulated by the cotton

---

[33] "The Fugitive Blacksmith or Events in the History of James W. C. Pennington, Pastor of a Presbyterian Church New York, Formerly a Slave in the State of Maryland" in *Great Slave Narratives*, Arna Bontemps, ed. (Boston: Beacon Press, 1969), 196.

[34] Ira Berlin, *Generations of Captivity* for the "migration generation"; Anthony E. Kaye, "The Second Slavery: Modernity in the Nineteenth-Century South and the Atlantic World," 627-650. Nineteenth-century slavery in the United States has been the focus on considerable scholarly attention in the past half-century. My understanding of the subject, political, socially, and economically, comes from many studies: Berlin, *Generations of Captivity;* Adam Rothman, *Slave Country: American Expansion and the Origins of the Deep South* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007); Edward Baptist, *The Half Has Never Been Told: Slavery and the Making of American Capitalism* (New York: Basic Books, 2016); Walter Johnson, *Soul by Soul: Life Inside the Antebellum Slave Market* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999); Stephen Deyle, *Carry Me Back: The Domestic Slave Trade in American Life* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006) among many others.

revolution occurring across the southern states. The cotton boom combined with the internal slave trade to reshape the American economy, remade African American life in all the states. The Chesapeake states, joined later by Kentucky (which became a state in 1792), became the key suppliers of slaves for the cotton frontier.[35]

The internal slave trade not only reshaped the lives of African Americans and of the American economy, it also shaped the politics of the south by creating an economic necessity for pro-slavery southern political defenses. The internal slave trade became the largest enterprise in the south aside from cotton and it developed new vocabulary, trading hubs, and regional centers and "reached into every cranny of southern society."[36] The slaves brought from Maryland, Virginia, and Kentucky entered into a new, restrictive slave society which developed from Georgia to Mississippi and by the 1840s was developing across the Mississippi River. The planters who moved to these states overwhelmingly brought with them or bought young men and women. As one plantation business veteran advised, "it is better to buy *none in families*, but to *select only choice, young hands from 14 to 25 years of age,* (buying no children or aged negroes)."[37]

The cotton regime in the south represented a second slavery because of new commodities produced in unprecedented quantities in previously economically marginal regions. Moreover, economies of states and the nation as a whole revolved around the lubrication and production of the slave economy, whether through supplying plantations, exporting slaves, or producing

---

[35] Berlin, *Generations of Captivity*, 161-2; Baptist, *The Half Has Never Been Told*, 35-37.

[36] Ibid., 168.

[37] Quote from Steven F. Miller, "Plantation Labor Organization and Slave Life on the Cotton Frontier: The Alabama-Mississippi Black Belt, 1815-1840," in Berlin and Morgan, eds., *Cultivation and Culture: Labor and the Shaping of Slave Life in the Americas* (Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia, 1993), 157, as quoted in Berlin, *Generations of Captivity*, 169.

commodities. This created a system of economics and government that supported and protected slavery and was the end result of capitalist development in the plantation south.[38] The expansion of capitalist market relations throughout the South stimulated cotton production, linked southern slavery with international markets, and created in the United States a market directly to supply those plantations upon which the border north rested.[39]

The slaves that were fed into this new trade from the Chesapeake, whose economy had transitioned from tobacco monoculture to mixed farming, stimulated the growth of towns and cities and created greater economic diversity as plantations diversified production. Maryland, "which is one of the smallest and most northern of the slaveholding states" produces "wheat, rye, Indian corn, tobacco, with some hemp, flax, [etc.]" and thus was heavily involved in the Atlantic grain processing and shipping economy. Because of soil exhaustion from tobacco overcultivation, however, Maryland slaveholders "soon commenced the business of breeding slaves for the more southern states" which has, as Pennington argues, "given an enormity to slavery, in Maryland, differing from that which attaches to the system in Louisiana, and equaled by none of the kind, except Virginia and Kentucky…"[40]

For the major slaveholders in eastern Maryland, who remained some the largest slaveholders in the region despite diversification, the market could also be closer to home.[41] When Pennington was four years old, he, his mother, and an older brother, were given to the son

[38] Kaye, Anthony E., "The Second Slavery", 627-631.

[39] For the capitalist connections that grew in response to the growth of antebellum slavery, see *Slavery's Capitalism: A New History of American Economic Development* edited by Sven Beckert and Seth Rockman (Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016).

[40] Pennington, "The Fugitive Blacksmith," 207.

[41] Berlin, *Generations of Captivity*, 212.

of his owner who "was about to settle as a wheat planter" in Washington County in middle Appalachia. For Pennington and his family this was tragic, as it began a period of separation from his father, although his new owner eventually bought his father because he was "a valuable slave"—not because it would unite a family. [42] For eastern Maryland planters, then, middle Appalachia was a market for slave exports for the first forty years of the early republic. The number of slaves grew in western Maryland in the early decades of the nineteenth century, increasing by 38% per decade in Washington County and 30% in Allegany County; the increase only began to stagnate in the 1830s.[43]

The stagnation occurred throughout Maryland (and to a lesser extent in middle Appalachian Pennsylvania) because of the erosion of slavery due to the border and the increasingly lucrative slave trade south. As more slaves escaped into Pennsylvania and as the prices increased for slaves further south where the threat of losing the investment altogether minimized, the stagnation became more pronounced. The importance of slavery to middle Appalachia, particularly in Maryland, did not change however.

The Ferry Hill Plantation records give evidence to this: middle Appalachian slaveowners still utilized free and unfree labor to make their economies profitable.[44] The slaves of middle Appalachia were employed in a number of different occupations outside of agriculture, signifying the mixed economy that grew there. Pennington worked not only in agricultural jobs on his owners' plantation but was also a blacksmith and dabbled in carpentry. This speaks to the

[42] Pennington, "The Fugitive Blacksmith," 207.

[43] Ancestry.com. *1790 United States Federal Census* [database on-line]; Ancestry.com. *1800 United States Federal Census* [database on-line]; Ancestry.com. *1810 United States Federal Census* [database on-line]; Ancestry.com. *1820 United States Federal Census* [database on-line]; Ancestry.com. *1830 United States Federal Census* [database on-line].

[44] Berlin, *Generations of Captivity*, 212.

necessary diversification of these western slaveholders as they grew primarily grains and produced extractive goods and their ability to employ slaves in made different forms of economic production. Evidence of this is also abundant later in the nineteenth century at the Ferry Hill Plantation, which was located near the Potomac River.[45]

Joseph Scott travelled through Washington County in 1807 and reported that the lands there were "esteemed equal if not superior in fertility to any in the state."[46] It is for this reason that John Blackford and his family established Ferry Hill Place. Located near the Potomac River, Ferry Hill and its' occupants witnessed many of the economic and infrastructure improvements that were constructed in Maryland during the antebellum period while also participating in economic activity that became the norm for middle Appalachian plantations in western Maryland.[47]

Ferry Hill's agricultural production centered around wheat but also included broom corn, potatoes, apples, hemp, and flax among others; it was plantations and smaller farmers that helped make Washington County a center of grain and flour production by 1840 in Maryland. Arteries of commerce existed in the county that allowed Blackford to mill his wheat locally and ship it to Baltimore for resale. These arteries of commerce were constructed during and after the Revolutionary period as localities demanded further infrastructure improvements from the state. He also sold to local markets, particularly his fruit and potato surplus.[48]

---

[45] Pennington, "The Fugitive Blacksmith", 209; *Ferry Hill Plantation Journal, January 4, 1838- January 15, 1839,* edited by Fletcher M. Green (Chapel Hill: The University of North Press, 1961), xx.

[46] Quote in *Ferry Hill Plantation Journal, January 4, 1838-January 15, 1839,* ed. Green, xii.

[47] Ibid., xii-xiii.

[48] Ibid., xvi.

The ability of Blackford to process and ship his produce is because of the infrastructure connections that were built over the previous half-century in Maryland. By the mid-nineteenth century, Baltimore became the hub of shipping and flour production, ending a process that began in the late eighteenth century. Because of this, middle Appalachia became a true economic hinterlands with a system of infrastructure and commerce created to get goods from the region to three different final destinations: Baltimore (particularly for western Maryland but also parts of southern Pennsylvania), Pittsburgh (whose growth in the nineteenth century accelerated due to the growth of southwestern Pennsylvania), and to a much smaller extent, Philadelphia.[49]

Blackford was able to make this work because he employed both slaves and hired labor. He owned twenty-five slaves who worked to tend the crops, harvest lumber, and the work the ferry located on the plantation property. Blackford also employed others, including women and African Americans, from outside the plantation to produce goods; in essence, using a local putting-out system, in this case to produce brooms.[50]

Blackford consistently relied upon hired labor, particularly during peak agricultural season—a process adopted by many others in Maryland, particularly middle Appalachia. Interracial workforces were common in northern Maryland, the need for labor and the instability of slavery on the border required owners to make it work. Importantly, however, racial boundaries that were interwoven through these practices were not overcome. Moreover, owners also tried to hire entire households to top into the labor of the farmhands' wives and children.[51]

[49] Grivno, *Gleanings of Freedom*, 33.

[50] *Ferry Hill Plantation Journal, January 4, 1838-January 15, 1839*, ed. Green, xviii, xx.

[51] Grivno, *Gleanings of Freedom*, 92-100.

Women were integral to the household economy especially after full integration into the capitalist market because all productive capacities were needed within the household. Much like the "old negro man" who Blackford paid to produce brooms, women's work often included lowkey industrial production. According to a daybook kept by Simeon Wilson, an owner of a mercantile business on the Baltimore Turnpike in Allegany County, women were active in producing cloth and articles of clothing. Women were also important to the economy not just as economic producers and laborers but consumers. Women, particularly in the upper classes, were important because of their ability to consume but in rural areas like middle Appalachia consumption takes its' place as part of a broader capitalist exchange economy.[52]

Importantly, however, Blackford saw himself as a generous owner but that did not preclude violence in maintaining order on his plantation. Violence was integral to the slave regime, a constant to maintaining the institution. Blackford often used corporal punishment on his slaves of all ages for anything from stealing peacocks to using profane language. While overseers, like the brutal man confronted by Pennington in his own experience were not present at Ferry Hill, violence was still there. The role of violence and the threat of violence in the slave regime was critical to its' functioning for two reasons: first, order and discipline had to be maintained for a plantation to function and that often meant violence and the threat of violence; and second, to increase productivity through both violence and the threat of violence. The role of violence meant that it was also omnipresent in the slave regimes of the south, no matter where they were. Pennington's life in slavery confirms this and that viciousness towards slaves came from multiple areas.[53]

---

[52] Simeon Wilson, Simeon Wilson Daybook, 1819-1820, MS 2999, *MdHS*.

[53] Pennington, "The Fugitive Blacksmith," 214.

Blackford, like many of his contemporaries, was involved in agricultural improvements. For slaveowners in borderland regions who had to temper their use of violence with knowledge that their slaves had a ready avenue of escape. The instability of slavery and along with the desire for more productive agriculture turned plantation- and slaveowners to agricultural improvements. Both Maryland and Pennsylvania were home to agricultural improvement societies in the antebellum period; both societies actively encouraged the use of innovative techniques.[54]

Capitalism worked so well with slavery because of both agricultural improvements and the ability to force slaves to work harder. Historians have traditionally understood violence as a path to maintaining discipline on a plantation but understanding the intersection of capitalism and slavery also forces an understanding that violence is integral to agricultural productivity advances. Indeed, Edward Baptist argues that owners regularly beat their slaves to extract productivity; that torture was the key "to an astonishing increase in cotton production that required no machinery. The threat of violence was combined with experiments in labor and economic activity that, according to Caitlin Rosenthal, allowed slaveowners in "allocating and reallocating labor from task to task…measuring and monitoring productivity and reproductivity."[55]

In the wheat-producing areas of the Chesapeake, agricultural machinery became an important investment and an area of experimentation for slaveowners. The slow evolution of

---

[54] Brugger, *Maryland, A Middle Temperament,* 206-207; *Ferry Hill Plantation Journal, January 4, 1838-January 15, 1839*, ed. Green, xvii.

[55] Edward Baptist, *The Half Has Never Been Told: Slavery and the Making of American Capitalism* (New York: Basic Books, 2014), 142; Caitlin Rosenthal, "Slavery's Scientific Management: Masters and Managers," in *Slavery's Capitalism: A New History of American Economic Development* ed. Sven Beckert and Seth Rockman (Philadelphia: The University of Philadelphia Press, 2016), 63.

agricultural machinery was because of desire by slaveowners and nonslaveowners alike to increased production and the agricultural machinery was not only consumed by northern farmers but also by southern planters whose primary crop was grains. Cyrus McCormick, who invented a new, much more efficient reaper, did so because of his experience in the wheat producing regions of Virginia. McCormick was the son of a wheat farmer in a region in Virginia that relied both on wheat and iron production. By the time that Blackford had established his plantation, the region around Richmond was developing into a center of milling industry in Virginia.[56]

Unfree labor was also important in Pennsylvania during the early nineteenth century. Unlike in Maryland, where the number of slaves can be solidly reported through census records, the numbers can be much more amorphous in Pennsylvania. The ability of people to continue owning slaves well past a period defined by law was bolstered by their ability to create a legal system in which unfree labor could be exploited throughout the nineteenth century. Moreover, official forms of unfree labor, like slavery, continued into the nineteenth century also.[57]

The records of slave birth registry for Fayette County gives insight into the both the slaves and slaveowners, their occupation, and how social stratification continued into the nineteenth century. The number of slaves in Pennsylvanian middle Appalachia was significantly smaller than in Maryland and was a tiny portion of the population; what is significant, however, is that the institution persisted until slaves stopped being counted in Pennsylvania in 1830 and

[56] Daniel B. Rood, "An International Harvest: The Second Slavery, The Virginia-Brazil Connection, and the Development of the McCormick Reaper" in *Slavery's Capitalism* ed. Beckert and Rockman, 90-91.

[57] For accounts of semipermanent unfree labor in Pennsylvania in the nineteenth century, see Nash and Soderlund, *Freedom by Degrees* and McCoy, "Forgetting Freedom," and Osbourne, "Invisible Hands." I have also used Gigantino, *The Ragged Road to Abolition,* Melish, *Disowning Slavery*, and Shane White, *Somewhat More Independent: The End of Slavery in New York City, 1770-1810* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 2004) to conceptualize how white's extended unfree, or semipermanent unfree labor, in the north. Importantly, as both my study and those above show, economic factors were always important in maintaining an unfree labor system—indeed, it was as important is the need for control of blacks.

that their numbers rose in those decades rather than declined. In 1833, the Pennsylvania legislature conducted an investigation because the 1830 census had shown an increase of 83 percent in the state's slave population between 1820 and 1830. As one legislator put it, it was an insult that the "land of Penn, which took the lead in emancipation" should have an increase in slaves especially because it could "excite considerable attention even beyond our own commonwealth." Some legislators' concerns were alleviated when they conducted an extensive investigation and found that the census takers had counted some held in term slavery, brought from Virginia, Maryland, and Delaware to Pennsylvania as bound laborers, as slaves in twenty-seven different counties (including all of those in middle Appalachia). The growth in the number of slaves, however, is important because it shows that census takers mistook those in some form of unfree labor as slaves, showing the enduring importance of unfree labor to the local economy.[58]

The endurance of the institution and the importance of unfree labor can be seen through who owned slaves and what their occupation was. Registry of slave births is important to this record and increasingly, slaves were owned by both townspeople and rural people in middle Appalachia. While the numbers of slaves and slaveowners dwindled, the importance of slaves as both labor, and to some extent, status symbols continued. Historians who have determined that slavers were not just status symbols but also valuable economic investments are confirmed in middle Appalachia: craftsman and farmers were just as likely as lawyers or government officials to own slaves in nineteenth century middle Appalachia.[59] The slaves of middle Appalachia, as

[58] *Abolitionist: or Record of the New England Anti-slavery Society Edited by A Committee*. July 1,1833, p. 104-106; Gigantino, *The Ragged Road to Abolition*, 171.

[59] RG-47 Birth Records for the County Governments, Fayette County Prothonotary. Birth Records for Negroes and Mulattoes, 1788-1826, *PSA.*

elsewhere in the nation, were utilized in various economic engagements not only in agriculture but also in towns and other non-agricultural worksites.

When in 1828 an ad appeared for a runaway in the *Hagerstown Torchlight and Public Advertiser* about "negro man named JAMES PEMBROOK, about 21 years of age… [who] mumbles or talks with his teeth closed, can read, and I believe write, is an excellent blacksmith, and pretty good rough carpenter," it signifies when Pennington (who changed his name after escape) joined a growing stream of self-emancipated men and women from the south fleeing north to gain freedom.[60] For Pennington, he admitted that he had "no knowledge of distance or direction—I know that Pennsylvania is a free state", he was emblematic of a belief among slaves that freedom lay in crossing the border between slavery and freedom represented by the Mason-Dixon Line in the east and the Ohio River in the west.[61] The proximity to the border undermined slavery in northern Maryland and especially in middle Appalachia. Washington and Allegany counties were the center of this, as slaves escaped not only from those counties but also the surrounding regions of Virginia through those counties.

The road to freedom was dangerous for a variety of reasons: the very real possibility of being apprehended by authorities and those watching for escape attempts, the fear and sadness in leaving behind friends and family and what they may face when the escape attempt has made, and the distinct possibility of a bad reception upon arriving in any of the border north states. Failure, more than anything else, was the biggest danger for escaped slaves due to a variety of obstacles: ignorance of geography and legal measures to prevent escape are most prominent.

---

[60] Runaway Ad, *Hagerstown Torchlight and Public Advertiser*, accessed from "Runaway Advertisement Records" in the *The Maryland State Archives Presents: Legacy of Slavery in Maryland* (An Archives of Maryland Electronic Publication).

[61] Pennington, "The Fugitive Blacksmith," 215.

The problem here is twofold: first, state authorities in Maryland and the southern states were designed to maintain control over slaves. Second, there was a cultural responsibility, especially among the lower class, in stopping slaves from escaping and to maintain the institution. The intersection of race and class on the road to freedom is important to understand why escape attempts often ended in failure.[62]

The African American community in Pennsylvania aided fugitives as much as they could and fugitives were often able to hide in those communities pending further escape north (often aiding and instigating the work of the PAS). Whites tended to be more ambivalent. They understood the rights of slaveholders to reclaim their property and often avoided physical confrontations to stop it; they were, however, to be offended if slavecatchers and kidnappers used aggressive tactics. Other whites who were involved or believed in abolitionism tended to aid fleeing slaves, angering their southern neighbors.[63]

Pennington wrote of his own flight, in which he had a conversation with a man who stopped him on a road on which he was lost. The man asked after his freedom papers, of which he had none, and when he replied that he had no papers, the man replied "you will be taken up before you have gone three miles" if he remained on that road because "there are men living on this road who are constantly on the look-out for your people."[64] Lower class whites had an interest in maintaining slavery; indeed, enforcers in law enforcement and slave catchers joined overseers as key to upholding slavery in the south and regaining slaves who fled north.[65]

---

[62] Peter Kolchin, *American Slavery, 1619-1877* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2003), 180-182.

[63] Harrold, *Border War*, 96-97.

[64] Pennington, "The Fugitive Blacksmith," 219.

[65] Berlin, *Generations of Captivity*, 234-236; Steven Lubet, *Fugitive Justice*, 54.

The fugitive slave issue aggravated sectional tensions in the South, particularly along the border between slavery and freedom. Soon after Pennington's escaped from slavery, slaveowners in Allegany, Washington, and St. Mary's County sent a petition to the state legislature of Maryland complaining of the fugitive slave issues due to the number of slaves fleeing the region (and surrounding regions in Virginia) and the ease with which those fugitives escaped. The petition, sent to the Maryland House of Delegates in 1816, requested help in stopping Pennsylvanians from "the employment and harboring of runaway negroes" and to "facilitate the regaining [of] them by their real owners." While a resolution failed in response to this in the Maryland Senate, in 1818, the assembly ordered Maryland Governor Charles Ridgely to send a resolution to both Pennsylvania and Delaware. Ridgely's message to Pennsylvania's Governor Findley relayed an understanding that the resolution was in "contravention of your laws" but the "Mischief[s]" were justly causing complaints "by the people of Maryland."[66]

The issue of fugitive protection in Pennsylvania continued and in 1820, slaveholders in the state argued they suffered "great imposition and serious inconvenience from the constant and ready protection afforded their runaway negroes by the citizens of Pennsylvania." Indeed, in 1820 in response to complaints, the Maryland legislature declared that "whenever a runaway slave is pursued and found in Pennsylvania, every possible difficulty is thrown in the way, so as to prevent the recovery of such slave" and that regular legal channels often fail resulting in violence.[67]

[66] Harrold, *Border War*, 24.

[67] Quotes from the petitions are taken from Harrold, *Border War*, 24.

Table 5.1 Newspaper Runaway Advertisements for Allegany and Washington County, Maryland, 1800-1839[68]			
	Allegany County	Washington County	Totals
1800-1809	8	22	30
1810-1819	14	39	53
1820-1829	14	61	75
1830-1839*	14	23	37
*The records for Allegany County end in 1834.			

Politics and society in middle Appalachia must be understood through the context of the political struggles over slaves, both among whites and blacks. As one historian has shown, most of the fugitive slaves who escaped through southern Pennsylvania came from counties that abutted Pennsylvania, these fugitive slaves joined or moved through a growing community of African Americans in middle Appalachia. While important to the communities as laborers, particularly in agriculture and service industries, they could also cause resentment among their white neighbors if they succeeded economically, causing racial frictions in the communities. By 1830, the African American community in middle Appalachia was growing faster than the white population and because of this, racial tensions increased throughout the region.[69]

This racism played out in the form of resentment among whites for blacks, particularly as the black population grew and even met with some success in the towns of western Pennsylvania. Rapid growth among the population in this region, both white and black, allowed

[68] The numbers in this graph are taken from *The Maryland State Archives Presents: Legacy of Slavery in Maryland, An Archives of Maryland Electronic Publication* database. "Runaway Advertisement Records, Allegany County" accessed from http://slavery2.msa.maryland.gov/pages/Search.aspx?&searchtype=basic&query=Allegany%20County&chk=00000000000000000000000000100&page=1&pgsize=50&id=ArchivalResearch_LoSC_RunawayAds (accessed October 28, 2017); "Runaway Advertisements, Washington County" accessed from http://slavery2.msa.maryland.gov/pages/Search.aspx?&searchtype=basic&query=washington%20county&chk=00000000000000000000000000100&page=1&pgsize=50&id=ArchivalResearch_LoSC_RunawayAds (accessed October 28, 2017). The data for Allegany County ends in 1834 and is therefore incomplete.

[69] David G. Smith, *On the Edge of Freedom: The Fugitive Slave Issue in South Central Pennsylvania, 1820-1870* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2013), 12-21.

for many opportunities for success. While that success is most notable in towns and among whites, it was by no means absent from the black community. Black migrants, whether freed or fugitives, were generally accepted, if not welcomed, as laborers in the burgeoning agricultural and industrial economies of southern and western Pennsylvania. Some African Americans, particularly in the service and mercantile industry, were able to attain both property and break into the middle class. For many whites, especially poor whites, the success of their black neighbors was a sore point and in more urban centers would prove the focal point of racial tensions that led to outbreaks of violence in the antebellum period.[70]

Importantly, the free black community in this region attained some success. In south central Pennsylvania, African Americans not only owned property but grew those holdings and wealth over time, being shop owners, small business owners (such as caterers), merchants, and clergymen. William Whipper, for instance, worked near Columbia, Pennsylvania as a manager of a lumber operation, and was able to establish a household based on relative economic security. This, as much as looking at agricultural and industrial development in this region, shows the complexity of social and economic development in this region.[71]

The growth of the African American population occurred in a tense period for both racist politics and the politics of slavery in the Chesapeake. In Maryland, as in Virginia, there was also an issue of control over state politics that resulted from competitions between slaveholders and nonslaveholders. In Virginia, most of this resistance comes from the Appalachian west, where slaveholding was not as widespread as in the east. In Maryland, it came from a political unified

[70] Willis L. Shirk, Jr. "Testing the Limits of Tolerance: Blacks and the Social Order in Columbia, Pennsylvania, 1800-1851," 37-47; Harper, *Transformation of Western Pennsylvania*, 129.

[71] Shirk, "Testing the Limits of Tolerance," 42.

west and Baltimore; where slaveholding was not as important as southeastern Maryland. The first third of the nineteenth century saw each state consumed by debates over representation and slavery.[72]

In Virginia in the 1820s, the debate over slavery arose because of the overrepresentation of the minority eastern elites. Because these eastern elites refused to share power with westerners, westerners in Virginia attacked the foundation of their power: slavery. The fear of western majorities depriving easterners of their slaves was enough to encourage stiff resistance to any western initiative in the constitutional convention of 1829-1830. Debates over representation, the purpose of government, federal-state relations, and internal improvements all revolved around the issue of slavery because it was the root of understanding for all of this for both easterners (who depended on it) and westerners (who resented it).[73]

The debate over slavery, and the possibility of emancipation in some form, ended with Nat Turner's Rebellion in 1831 in Maryland. One of the most deadly in American history, the fear it generated caused Virginia and other southern states to stiffen laws on slavery and retrenched the system. Articulation of a proslavery defense of the institution that justified slavery and an increasing fear of a free black population transformed Virginian politics and began transformations of other southern states, particularly when it came to the safety and preservation of whiteness.[74]

---

[72] See Chapter 2 for a full accounting of these political alliances between rural and urban centers and the impact of slavery on those alliances. Also, Brugger, *Maryland: A Middle Temperament* and Ferguson, *Early Western Pennsylvania Politics*.

[73] Wolf, *Race and Liberty in the New Nation*, 183-193.

[74] Ibid., 196-212.

After Nat Turner's rebellion, Marylanders began to petition the Maryland legislature over the slavery issue. Petitions ranged from supporting African Americans as a "well-ordered" people to the belief that "liberation of slaves was repugnant." The legislature established a committee, composed entirely of large slaveholders (and one northern Marylander who was a large slaveholder) that had hearings on slavery. The "Brawner committee," named after Henry Brawner, a large southern Maryland slaveholder, attempted to end the erosion of slavery in northern Maryland not by shoring up slavery (which occurred in Virginia) but rather by attempting to rid the state of so called "awful evil" institution and the African Americans, both free and enslaved, that Marylanders had to deal with. The goal was to end slavery and rid the state of African Americans through an emancipation-colonization scheme and create a white, free-labor state.[75]

Resistance to this proposal came from all across Maryland. Despite the legislature's appropriation of almost $250,000 over twenty years to make the plan happen, Marylanders were not so keen on ridding themselves of slavery and African Americans. For southern Marylanders, the reasons are obvious: their livelihood depended on slavery. For northern Marylanders, who also opposed this proposition, the reasons are a little more complicated but come down to the need for labor. While slavery as an institution was unstable in the region, the need for labor was not and free blacks were just as likely to fill that need as whites. Northern Marylanders did not report the slaves that were freed and southern Marylanders did not enforce the legislature's decision and the debate over slavery ended in Maryland, at least in official political circles, until the eve of the Civil War.[76]

---

[75] William W. Freehling, *The Road to Disunion, Volume I: Secessionists at Bay, 1776-1854* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 202-204.

[76] Ibid., 204-205; the need for labor is further discussed in Max Grivno, *Gleanings of Freedom*.

The desire to resolve both the issue of slavery and of free blacks was encapsulated by the American Colonization Society (ACS) which was formed in 1816 and designed to rid the United States of both the institution and free African Americans who many believed could not be successfully assimilated in American society.[77] The ACS was an attractive idea for many Americans, particularly before the onset of proslavery arguments in the South, to be rid of slavery and African Americans altogether. In Pennsylvania, for instance, there were two types of supporters for the Pennsylvania Colonization Society, an auxiliary organization of the ACS. The first were people who believed that racism could never be reconciled and this was the only way around resentment of free blacks and resistance to abolition. The second were those who believed slavery was an impediment to political and economic development of the United States and saw the PCS and ACS as a way to rid the United States of the burden.[78] While it did gain some purchase in both white and black society, particularly before the 1840s, it never gained traction enough to be enacted on a grand scale. Indeed, the attempt to do so in Maryland ultimately failed, as did the colonization project as a whole despite the long-lived desire by many, especially whites, in carrying out this program through the nineteenth century.[79]

The ACS was active in both Maryland and Pennsylvania, as in many other states, although the state-specific activities and complexions differed depending on the role of slavery in that state. The Pennsylvania Colonization Society (PCS) was founded in 1826 as the state auxiliary of the ACS. The PCS, like many other chapters of the ACS, had members with many

---

[77] Eric Burin, *Slavery and the Peculiar Solution: A History of the American Colonization Society* (Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 2005), 1.

[78] Beverly C. Tomek, *Colonization and Its Discontents: Emancipation, Emigration, and Antislavery Antebellum Pennsylvania* (New York: NYU Press, 2011), 2-3.

[79] Freehling, *The Road to Disunion, Volume I*, 205; Burin, *Slavery and the Peculiar Solution*, 160-161.

different motivations; some joined to rid themselves of African Americans while others for the emancipatory possibilities of the organization. Importantly, the PCS was aware of and involved in debates in the Border South, like Maryland, and understood the possibility of ending slavery could be tied to colonization.[80]

Race was an important factor in both the ACS and PCS, as there was an expectation that African Americans would join in the efforts to relocate them outside of the United States and an equal resistance to such an expatriation within the African American community. The extremely negative reports coming from Liberia, including the deaths of colonists sent there, combined with the understanding of African Americans as Americans to preclude widespread support for colonization schemes in the African American community either in Pennsylvania or elsewhere. Thus, the promise of colonization for many whites was not felt by African Americans, nor was the political will truly there among leaders or slaveholders, particularly after 1840.[81]

The schemes for colonization were not lost upon middle Appalachia. Intimately aware of these attempts at figuring out the slavery problem, Maryland slaveholders joined into the movement, particularly those in the west. The problem for slaveholders in Maryland, and across the South, was the attitude of their fellow slaveholders, particularly large ones. Eric Burin has shown that smaller slaveholders, especially those that manumit one or two slaves, did not receive much attention, either good or bad. On the other hand, those who tried to manumit slaves in large numbers did face pushback from their fellow slaveholders. Margaret Mercer, of Ann Arundel County, for instance, faced pushback in not just trying to free her slaves in preparation for colonization but also in the way in which she did it. Mercer not only planned to send them to

[80] Eric Burin, *Slavery and the Peculiar Solution*, 79-81.

[81] Ibid., 80-83.

Africa but educated them, one even received a medical education. When the time came for her slaves to be freed and sent to Africa, some balked; she initially kept them in slavery until eventually freeing them completely without colonizing them, further exasperating her slaveholding neighbors.[82]

The move by Mercer to free her slaves and colonize them was not a single event. Colonization societies also reached into middle Appalachia, particularly in western Maryland, from which nine emigrants were sent to Cape Palmas, Liberia, in 1835 on the brig *Bourne*. Agents of the Maryland Colonization Society chose Cape Palmas because of the desirability and potential profitability in the region. Once Cape Palmas was purchased with assurances that local Africans could traverse the territory at need, settlement occurred. Although there were issues, including diseases and supplies shortages, it was the preferred location of MCS settlement.[83]

Race, slavery, and capitalism combined to create a tense environment in middle Appalachia; the relations often became inflamed during major sectional debates over slavery but never entirely disappeared. The hardening of slavery and the growth of the Underground Railroad angered southern slaveowners at the same time that resentment against free blacks grew in northern communities, particularly along the border between freedom and slavery, grew among whites. The hardening of racial attitudes and anger of slaveowners ensured that the border remained a place of sectional, economic, and social tension during the antebellum period.

---

[82] Ibid., 103-104.

[83] Campell, *Maryland in Africa: The Maryland State Colonization Society, 1831-1857* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1971), 51-53, 70-73; Records of this emigration come from "Colonization Society Records" for Allegany County, *The Maryland State Archives Present: Legacy of Slavery in Maryland* accessed from http://slavery2.msa.maryland.gov/pages/Search.aspx?&searchtype=adv&query=````````Allegany``````````&page=1&pgsize=50&id=ArchivalResearch_LoSC_ColonizationSociety (accessed November 2, 2017).

Epilogue
Prigg v. Pennsylvania and the National Borderland

Middle Appalachia's integration into national structures of slavery and antislavery coincided with a period of intensification of the slavery issue. The 1840s and 1850s are an especially notable period, with the decay of the second party system, the rise of specifically antislavery party, further agitation of the fugitive slave issue, and an increasingly aggressive abolitionist and proslavery politics. Pennsylvania and Maryland, due to their location straddling the border of slavery and freedom, were affected by these debates; state politics were dominated by national issues.

There was also a breakdown of interstate diplomacy that helped to maintain a balance in the border region. The interstate relations between Maryland and Pennsylvania (alongside Delaware and New Jersey) were tenuous at best beginning with the first Maryland legislature petition in 1818. Marylanders consistently believed that Pennsylvanians were assisting in the escape of their slave property; an issue that continued throughout the antebellum period. In 1826, for instance, a legation of Maryland state senators were sent to New Jersey to find if they could secure "aid by legislative provisions…for the recovery of persons bound to…citizens of Maryland." Since the New Jersey legislature was not in session, the envoys went to Delaware instead, where they were able to secure some help. New Jerseyans especially stressed cooperation with southerners and maintenance of law and order on the border, showing once again how slavery is national, and politics that support slavery extend north of the border well into the antebellum period.[1]

[1] Harrold, *Border War*, 73-74; Gigantino, *The Ragged Road to Abolition*, 223.

In the late 1830s, however, the fugitive slave issue came to head with seizure of Margaret Morgan and her three children by a Maryland slavecatcher. Allowed to live as a free woman by her owner, John Ashford, she married freeman Jerry Morgan in the 1820s. Ashford died in 1824 and did not formally emancipate Margaret; regardless, Margaret and her husband moved to Pennsylvania in 1832 and had three children together. In 1837, Ashford's widow, Margaret Ashmore, claimed that Margaret Morgan (and her children) were her property and hired a slavecatcher to bring them back.[2]

The slavecatcher, Edward Prigg, captured Margaret and her three children and took them back to Maryland. Prigg violated Pennsylvania's personal liberty law of 1826, which required a court order for anyone to remove accused fugitives from the state. The law was passed in response to agitation by Maryland after it sent a delegation at the same time as Delaware and New Jersey. The bill was the most contentious of that legislative session because abolitionists and other who opposed the bill argued that fugitive slaves were the province of Congress because of the fugitive slave clause of the Constitution and, therefore, Pennsylvania should not legislate on the issue.[3]

Jerry Morgan appealed to the governor of Pennsylvania to aid in the return of his family, one that the governor and legislature heeded. Unfortunately for Jerry, he drowned after being accused of being a fugitive himself (he lost his papers proving that he was not) and attempting to run away. Pennsylvania's request for extradition of Prigg was awkward for Maryland: not doing it might create a crisis of northern states refusing all requests to return slaves, doing it seemed a

[2] H. Robert Baker, *Prigg v. Pennsylvania: Slavery, the Supreme Court, and the Ambivalent Constitution* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2012), 1.

[3] Sinha, *The Slave's Cause*, 390; Baker, *Prigg v. Pennsylvania*, 76-77.

sacrifice of Marylanders' constitutional rights to their property and the fugitive slave clause. In another example of interstate diplomacy, Maryland's assembly negotiated with both Prigg and the Pennsylvania assembly in order for this case to be resolved by the Supreme Court.[4]

The case was decided in 1842 around two questions: first, did the personal liberty law of 1826 violate the Constitution; and second, did the law violate the Fugitive Slave Act of 1793. The Court, with Chief Justice Robert Taney presiding, decided yes to both questions. The decision provided an opening to free states, however, in enforcing recapture laws passed by slave states. The onus on slave catching rested not upon the states but upon the federal government, it was a constitutional provision.[5]

The irony of this case was most apparent in 1850, when Congress passed the fugitive slave law of 1850. This law created a system of federal agents and courts that relied upon the states to maintain slavery by returning fugitive slaves. For southerners, who typically argued for limited federal government and strong state governments, this seemed out of character until the enormity of the fugitive issue is taken into account. An estimated one thousand fugitives escaped slavery every year, disappearing into the northern black communities or Canada and causing an enormous economic loss to the South. For northerners, this was not only hypocritical—states' rights southerners turning into proponents of strong federal power—it was also unbearable to those who disagreed with the institution of slavery, particularly the vocal abolitionist organizations, and even to those who were ambivalent to the institution of slavery and the plight of those enslaved.[6]

---

[4] Baker, *Prigg v. Pennslyvania*, 112-113.

[5] Prigg v. Pennsylvania. 41 US 539 (1842) *Oyez*. Accessed November 11, 2017. https://www.oyez.org/cases/1789-1850/41us539.

[6]McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 78-81; Kolchin, *American Slavery*, 157-158.

Middle Appalachians, both black and white, understood these issues intimately. As the market revolution occurred in antebellum America, capitalist market connections spread throughout the nation, linking far-flung places of productions with financiers and markets. It also witnessed the "widespread commodification of processes—not merely exchange processes, but production processes, distribution processes, and investment processes" that allowed for the relatively rapid development of middle Appalachia.[7] Moreover, the Underground Railroad that went through middle Appalachia ensured that the region continued to be a site of conflict between North and South in the two decades prior to the Civil War.

By the 1840s, middle Appalachia underwent full integration into national structures, not just of slavery and antislavery, but also of the capitalist market connections that were critical to successful development. As part of this, unfree labor was necessary for both capitalism, development, and the creation of a borderland. The introduction of slavery predated white settlement but also critically helped whites as they moved into the region.

For a century, those settling in middle Appalachia settled in a borderlands region. Originally an imperial borderlands between Great Britain and France, when imperial attention focused on events around the Ohio River Valley, it was also a colonial borderland as Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Maryland struggled to maintain control over a lightly-settled region with little colonial authority and an active Native American presence. Firm borders between Pennsylvania and Virginia and between Pennsylvania and Maryland were only established in the late colonial period by the colonies themselves without taking consideration of the people who inhabited the region.

---

[7] Wallerstein as quoted in Dunaway, *The Last American Frontier,* 12.

It was during the foundational period after American independence that the groundwork was laid not just for market capitalist connections but also for the creation of another borderland. As middle Appalachia moved away from an imperial and colonial borderland, it moved toward a national borderland between slavery and freedom. As white settlers moved into the region from the surrounding colonies, they brought slaves with them. These slaves were not status symbols and not only formed the crux of economic development (especially in agriculture) but also the nuclei of the African American community that developed in the region during a transitional period in the late eighteenth century.

The 1790s were especially emblematic of this transitional period. As settlers moved into the region in increasing numbers, they began to integrate into state and national politics in ways not seen during the Revolutionary period. Moreover, the number of unfree laborers—in the form of black slaves—increased during this period. The border that was created by the 1780 gradual emancipation law in Pennsylvania slowed and destabilized the growth of the institution but did not stop it. Indeed, the "post-emancipation" North" could better be "described as a region whose transition from a society with slaves" remained incomplete until the advent of the Civil War.[8] Not only were slaveowners still moving into the region, they were doing so and ignoring the border.

The transitional period also saw increasingly complex political and economic activity and consolidation of classes. Readily identifiable class structures developed, particularly in the 1790s, with slaveownership being a sign of middle- or upper-class status. Moreover, a small but growing lower class that was landless, tenanted, or transitory developed and provided needed

[8] Berlin, *Generations of Captivity*, 233.

labor, particularly in agriculture and extractive industries. It was also during this period that mixed-race worksites became more common, a trend that continued into the antebellum period.

It was during the nineteenth century that middle Appalachia fully integrated, not just into the economy of the United States, but also as a borderland where conflict was common. It was the site of interstate controversies over fugitive slaves, as the state legislatures worked to control labor, protect their citizens, or a combination of both. Maryland and Pennsylvania were especially active, in large part because of the artificial nature of the Mason-Dixon Line with no natural boundary delineating the boundary. As such, slavery became much more unstable in northern Maryland, including in middle Appalachia, causing political and social tensions due to economic loss and the increasingly polarized "free" North and South.

The growth of the Underground Railroad also allowed for the growth of African American communities in middle Appalachia. The region was home to relatively few free African Americans during the antebellum period, particularly when compared to eastern cities like Philadelphia or Baltimore. Still, they formed an important component of society not just for their economic presence but also because they provided, along with white allied abolitionists, a cover for fugitive slaves.

Middle Appalachians were also involved in national structures of race and antislavery. The Maryland Colonization Society, an ancillary of the American Colonization Society, were active recruiters and campaigners in middle Appalachia. That they were proves that sentiments were not uniform in middle Appalachia on African Americans and the institution of slavery; the divided opinions represent a microcosm not just of the borderland regions of the upper South and lower North, but also of the United States as a whole.

Middle Appalachia represents an excellent study in the human construction of capitalism. White residents of middle Appalachia brought with them notions of race, class, and slavery, and used them to construct a labor and economic system that allowed for development and integration of middle Appalachia during the late eighteenth century and nineteenth century. While capitalism was being constructed across the United States, particularly after independence, in middle Appalachia it was occurring in a borderland and in a mixed economy with free and unfree labor organized based along a race and class system that benefitted, in large part, those at the top of middle Appalachian society and outside actors. Moreover, unlike other regions along with borderland, the transitory nature of the population also created a nebulous border that coincided with an increasingly tense national atmosphere surrounding slavery.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Archives and Collections

Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia (HSP)
Philadelphia County Wills, 1682-1819
Papers of the Pennsylvania Abolition Society

Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore (MdHS)
Simeon Wilson Daybook, 1819-1820

Maryland State Archives (MSA)
A Digest of the Laws of Maryland, Early State Records Online
Legacy of Slavery in Maryland, An Archives of Maryland Electronic Publication
Maryland Colonial Census, 1776
Proceedings of the Convention of the Province of Maryland, 1774-1776, an Archives of Maryland Online Publication

National Archives and Records Administration, Washington D.C. (NARA)
First Census of the United States, 1790
Second Census of the United States, 1800
Third Census of the United States, 1810
Fourth Census of the United States, 1820
Fifth Census of the United States, 1830
Sixth Census of the United States, 1840
United States Direct Tax of 1798: Tax Lists for the State of Pennsylvania

Pennsylvania State Archives (PSA)
Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania
Septennial Census Returns, 1779-1863, Records of the General Assembly
Warrant Registers, 1733-1957, Records of the Land Office
Tax and Exoneration List Lists, 1762-1794, Records of the Office of the Comptroller General
Certificates of Registry and Birth Returns for Negroes and Mulattos, Records of the County Governments, Fayette County, Prothonotary

Register of Wills Office, Fayette County, Pennsylvania
Fayette, Wills No. 1, Vol. 1-3, 1784-1833

Senator John Heinz History Center, Library and Archives Division
John Holker Papers, 1770-1814
Papers of Robert Ayres, 1785-1837

Published and Online Primary Documents

Ferguson, James E. *Selected Writings of Albert Gallatin*. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1967.

Ferry Hill Plantation Journal, January 4, 1838-January 15, 1839. Edited by Fletcher M. Green. *The James Sprunt Studies in History and Political Science*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 1961.

Harvey, Katherine A., editor. "The Lonaconing Journals: The Founding of a Coal and Iron Company, 1837-1840." In *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 67, no. 2 (1977).

Hening, William Waller. *Statutes at Large of Virginia: Being a Collection of all the Laws of Virginia from the first session of the Legislature, in the year 1619*. Transcribed by Freddie L. Spradlin. Accessed from http://vagenweb.org/hening/vol09.htm.

Herrin, Cynthia, editor. *Fayette County, Pennsylvania Vital Records, 1750-1890*. [database on-line]. Provo, UT, USA: Ancestry.com Operations Inc, 1999.

Mitchel, James T. and Henry Flanders, commissioners. *The Statues at Large of Pennsylvania from 1682-1801 Compiled under the authority of the act of May 19, 1887 Volume 9*. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, 1896-1909.

Pennington, James W. C. "The Fugitive Blacksmith or Events in the History of James W. C. Pennington, Pastor of a Presbyterian Church New York, Formerly a Slave in the State of Maryland." In *Great Slave Narratives* edited by Arna Bontemps. Boston: Beacon Press, 1969.

Pinkney, William. "Speech of William Pinkney, Esq., in the House of Delegates of Maryland, at their session in November 1789." *Princeton University Digital Library*. Accessed from http://pudl.princeton.edu/objects/bz60cx01b#page/20/mode/2up.

Social Explorer. https://www.socialexplorer.com/help/3067

Washington, George. Proclamation 3B—Cessation of Violence and Obstruction of Justice in Protest of Liquor Laws, September 15, 1792" *The American Presidency Project* "George Washington, President of the United States: 1789-1797" accessed from http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=65427.

Washington, George. "Proclamation—Authorizing Military Intervention to End Violence and Obstruction of Justic in Protest of Liquor Laws in Pennsylvania" *The American Presidency Project* "George Washington, President of the United States: 1789-1797" accessed from http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=65478.

Books

Adams, Henry. *The Life of Albert Gallatin.* Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott & Co., 1879.

Anderson, Fred. *Crucible of War: The Seven Years' War and the Fate of Empire in British North America, 1754-1766*. New York: Vintage Books, 2001.

Bailyn, Bernard. *The Barbarous Years: The Conflict of Civilizations, 1600-1675.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2012.

_____. *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967.

Baker, H. Robert. *Prigg v. Pennsylvania: Slavery, the Supreme Court, and the Ambivalent Constitution*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2012.

Barker, Charles Albro. *The Background of the Revolution in Maryland*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1940.

_____. *Voyagers to the West: A Passage in the Peopling of America on the Eve of Revolution.* New York: Random House, 1986.

Baptist, Edward E. *The Half Has Never Been Told: Slavery and the Making of American Capitalism*. New York: Basic Books, 2014.

_____. *Soul by Soul: Life Inside the Antebellum Slave Market.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999.

Barr, Daniel P. *A Colony Sprung from Hell: Pittsburgh and the Struggle for Authority on the Western Pennsylvania Frontier, 1744-1794*. Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 2014.

Beckert, Sven. *Empire of Cotton: A Global History*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2015.

Beckert, Sven and Seth Rockman, editors. *Slavery's Capitalism: A New History of American Economic Development.* Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016.

Berlin, Ira. *Generations of Captivity: A History of African-American Slaves.* New York: Belknap Press, 2004.

_____. *Many Thousands Gone: The First Two Centuries of Slavery in North America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000.

Bouton, Terry. *Taming Democracy: "The People," the Founders, and the Troubled Ending of the American Revolution.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Buck, Solon J. and Elizabeth Hawthorn Buck. *The Planting of Civilization in Western Pennsylvania.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1968.

Breen, T. H. *American Insurgents, American Patriots*. New York: Hill and Wang, 2010.

_____. *The Marketplace of Revolution: How Consumer Politics Shaped American Independence.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Brown, Kathleen M. *Good Wives, Nasty Wenches, and Anxious Patriarchs: Gender, Race, and Power in Colonial Virginia*. Charlotte, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996.

Browne, William Hande. *Maryland: The History of a Palatinate.* New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1912.

Brugger, Robert J. *Maryland, A Middle Temperament: 1634-1980*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1996.

Brunhouse, Robert L. *The Counter-Revolution in Pennsylvania, 1776-1790*. Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania Historical Commission, 1942.

Burin, Eric. *Slavery and the Peculiar Institution: A History of the American Colonization Society.* Gainesville, FL: University of Florida Press, 2005.

Calloway, Colin G. *The Scratch of a Pen: 1763 and the Transformation of North America.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Campbell, Penelope. *Maryland in Africa: The Maryland State Colonization Society, 1831-1857.* Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1971.

Carp, Benjamin, L. *Defiance of the Patriots: The Boston Tea Party and the Making of America*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2010.

Chernow, Ron. *Washington: A Life*. New York: The Penguin Press, 2010.

Clark, Christopher. *The Roots of Rural Capitalism: Western Massachusetts, 1780-1860.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, 1990.

Cornell, Saul. *The Other Founders: Anti-Federalism & the Dissenting Tradition in America, 1788-1828.* Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1999.

Cummins, Joseph. *Ten Tea Parties: Patriotic Protests That History Forgot*. Philadelphia: Quirk Books, 2012.

Cunz, Dieter: *The Maryland Germans: A History*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1948.

Crumrine, Boyd, Franklin Ellis, and Austin N. Hungerford. *History of Washington County, Pennsylvania: with biographical sketches of many of its pioneers and prominent men.* Philadelphia: H. L. Everts & Co., 1882.

Davis, David Brion. *Inhuman Bondage: The Rise and Fall of Slavery in the New World*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Deyle, Stephen. *Carry Me Back: The Domestic Slave Trade in America Life*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Dunaway, Wilma. *Slavery in the American Mountain South*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

_____. *The First American Frontier: Transition to Capitalism in Southern Appalachia, 1700-1860*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996.

Ellis, Franklin. *History of Fayette County, Pennsylvania: with biographical sketches of many of its pioneers and prominent men.* Philadelphia: L. H. Everts & Co., 1882.

Elkins, Stanley and Eric McKitrick. *The Age of Federalism: The Early American Republic, 1788-1800.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Ferguson, Russell J. *Early Western Pennsylvania Politics*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1938.

Fields, Barbara Jeanne. *Slavery and Freedom on the Middle Ground: Maryland during the Nineteenth Century*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1985.

Fischer, David Hackett. *Washington's Crossing*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Foret, Jeff. *Race Relations at the Margins: Slaves and Poor Whites in the Antebellum Southern Countryside.* Baton Rouge, LA: LSU Press, 2010.

Fogleman, Aaron Spencer. *Hopeful Journeys: German Immigration, Settlement, and Political Culture in Colonial America, 1717-1775.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1996.

Freehling, William W. *The Road to Disunion, Volume I: Secessionists at Bay, 1776-1854*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Gellman, David N. *Emancipating New York: The Politics of Slavery and Freedom, 1777-1827*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2006.

Gigantino II, James J. *The Ragged Road to Abolition: Slavery and Freedom in New Jersey, 1775-1865*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2015.

Graeff, Arthur D., M. Kollmorgen, et. al., *The Pennsylvania Germans*. Edited by Ralph Woods. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1942.

Grivno, Max. *Gleanings of Freedom: Free and Slave Labor along the Mason-Dixon Line, 1790-1860*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2014.

Guzy, Dan. *Navigation on the Upper Potomac River and Its Tributaries (Second Edition)*. Online: WHILBR, 2011. Accessed from http://www.whilbr.org/assets/uploads/NavigationOnTheUpperPotomac.pdf

Harper, R. Eugene. *The Transformation of Western Pennsylvania, 1770-1800*. Pittsburgh, PA: Pittsburgh University Press, 1991.

Harrold, Stanley. *Border War: Fighting over Slavery before the Civil War.* Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2010.

Heavner, Robert Own. *Economic Aspects of Indentured Servitude in Colonial Pennsylvania.* New York: Arno Press, 1978.

Hogeland, William. *The Whiskey Rebellion: George Washington, Alexander Hamilton, and the Frontier Rebels Who Challenged America's Newfound Sovereignty.* New York: Scribner, 2006.

Holton, Woody. *Forced Founders: Indians, Debtors, Slaves and the Making of the Revolution in Virginia*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 1999.

Howe, Daniel Walker. *What Hath God Wrought: The Transformation of America, 1815-1848*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Inscoe, John. *Mountain Masters: Slavery and the Sectional Crisis in Western North Carolina.* Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1989.

Isenburg, Nancy. *White Trash: The 400-Year Untold History of Class in America*. New York: Random House, 2016.

Jensen, Merrill. *New Nation: A History of the United States during the Confederation, 1781-1789*. New York: Random House, Inc., 1966.

Johnson, Walter. *Soul by Soul: Life Inside the Antebellum Slave Market*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999.

Jordon, Philip D. *The National Road*. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1948.

Kars, Marjoleine. *Breaking Loose Together: The Regulator Rebellion in Pre-Revolutionary North Carolina*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002.

Kolchin, Peter. *American Slavery, 1619-1877*. New York: Hill and Wang, 2003.

Kulikoff, Allan. *The Agrarian Origins of American Capitalism*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1992.

Lakomäki, Sami. *Gathering Together: The Shawnee People through Diaspora and Nationhood, 1600-1870*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2014.

Land, Aubrey C. *Colonial Maryland: A History.* Millwood, NY: KTO Press, 1981.

Larson, John Lauritz. *Internal Improvement: National Public Works and the Promise of Popular Government in the Early United States*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 2001.

_____. *The Market Revolution in America: Liberty, Ambition, and the Eclipse of the Common Good*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Lewis, Ronald L. *Coal, Iron, and Slaves: Industrial Slavery in Maryland and Virginia, 1715-1865.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1979.

Lightner, David L. *Slavery and the Commerce Power: How the Struggle against the Interstate Slave Trade led to the Civil War.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2006.

Locke, Mary Stoughton. *Anti-Slavery in America from the Introduction of African Slaves to the Prohibition of the Slave Trade, 1619-1808.* Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Library, 1965.

Lubet, Steven. *Fugitive Justice: Runaways, Rescuers, and Slavery on Trial*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010.

Maier, Pauline. *From Resistance to Revolution: Colonial Radicals and the Development of American Opposition*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1992.

_____. *Ratification: The People Debate the Constitution, 1787-1788.* New York: Simon and Schuster, 2011.

Martin, Jonathan D. *Divided Mastery: Slave Hiring in the American South*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004.

Mason, Matthew. *Slavery and Politics in the Early American Republic.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2006.

McCusker, John J. and Russell R. Menard. *The Economy of British America, 1607-1789*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1991.

McPherson, James M. *Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.

McSherry, James. *History of Maryland; From its First Settlement in 1634, to the Year 1848*. Baltimore: John Murphy, 1848.

Melish, Joanne Pope. *Disowning Slavery: Gradual Emancipation and "Race" in New England, 1780-1860.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, 1998.

Merrell, James H. *Into the American Woods: Negotiators on the Pennsylvania Frontier.* New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1999).

Middlekauff, Robert. *The Glorious Cause: The American Revolution, 1763-1789.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Morgan, Edmund S. *American Slavery, American Freedom*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1975.

Nash, Gary and Jean Soderlund. *Freedom by Degrees: Emancipation in Pennsylvania and its Aftermath.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Neuenshwander, John A. *The Middle Colonies and the Coming of the American Revolution.* Port Washington, NY: Kennikat Press, 1973.

Parkinson, Robert G. *The Common Cause: Creating Race and Nation in the American Revolution*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 2016.

Rice, Otis K. *The Allegheny Frontier: West Virginia Beginnings, 1730-1830.* Lexington, KY: The University Press of Kentucky, 1970.

Richards, Leonard L. *The Slave Power: The Free North and Southern Domination, 1780-1860.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2000.

Rockman, Seth. *Scraping By: Wage Labor, Slavery, and Survival in Early Baltimore.* Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins University Press, 2009.

Rushforth, Brett. *Bonds of Alliance: Indigenous and Atlantic Slaveries in New France*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 2012.

Salafia, Matthew. *Slavery's Borderland: Freedom and Bondage along the Ohio River*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013.

Salinger, Sharon V. *"To serve well and faithfully": Labor and Indentured Servants in Pennsylvania, 1682-1800.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Scharf, J. Thomas. *History of Maryland from the Earliest Period to the Present Day, Volume II: The Struggle for Liberty, 1766-1812.* Hatboro, PA: Tradition Press, 1879.

_____. *History of Western Maryland: Being a History of Frederick, Montgomery, Carroll, Washington, Allegany, and Garrett Counties from the Earliest Period to the Present Day, Volume I.* Philadelphia: Louis H. Everts, 1882.

_____. *History of Western Maryland: Being a History of Frederick, Montgomery, Carroll, Washington, Allegany, and Garrett Counties from the Earliest Period to the Present Day, Volume II.* Philadelphia: Louis H. Everts, 1882.

Seawright, Thomas B. *The Old Pike Road: A History of the National Road*. Uniontown, PA: By Author, 1894.

Sellers, Charles. *The Market Revolution: Jacksonian America, 1815-1846*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Sharp, James Roger. *American Politics in the Early Republic: The New Nation in Crisis.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1993.

Sinha, Manisha. *The Slave's Cause: A History of Abolition*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2017.

Silver, Peter. *Our Savage Neighbors: How Indian War Transformed Early America*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 2008.

Sky, Theodore. *The National Road and the Difficult Path to Sustainable National Investment*. Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 2011.

Smith, David G. *On the Edge of Freedom: The Fugitive Slave Issue in South Central Pennsylvania, 1820-1870*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2013.

Taylor, Alan. *American Colonies: The Settling of North America*. New York: Penguin Books, 2002.

Thomas, James W. and T. J. C. Williams. *History of Allegany County, Maryland, Volume I.* Baltimore: Regional Publishing Co., 1923.

Tomek, Beverly C. *Colonization and Its Discontents: Emancipation, Emigration, and Antislavery Antebellum Pennsylvania*. New York: NYU Press, 2011.

White, Richard. *The Middle Ground: Indian, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

White, Shane. *Somewhat More Independent: The End of Slavery in New York City, 1770-1810.* Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Press, 1991.

Wade, Richard C. *Slavery in the Cities: The South, 1820-1860*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.

Waldstreicher, David. *Slavery's Constitution: From Revolution to Ratification*. New York: Hill and Wang, 2010.

Warren, Wendy. *New England Bound: Slavery and Colonization in Early America*. New York: Liveright, 2017.

Whitman, T. Stephen. *Challenging Slavery in the Chesapeake: Black and White Resistance to Human Bondage, 1775-1865.* Baltimore: Maryland Historical Society, 2007.

Wilentz, Sean. *Chants Democratic: New York City and the Rise of the American Working Class, 1788-1850*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.

_____. *The Rise of American Democracy: Jefferson to Lincoln.* New York: W. W. Norton, 2005.

Wolf, Eva Sheppard. *Race and Liberty in the New Nation: Emancipation in Virginia from the Revolution to Nat Turner's Rebellion*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2006.

Wood, Gordon S. *Empire of Liberty: A History of the Early Republic, 1789-1815*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.

_____. *The Creation of the American Republic, 1776-1787.* Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina, 1998.

Zilversmit, Arthur. *The First Emancipation: The Abolition of Slavery in the North.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967.

Articles and Book Chapters

Adelman, Jeremy and Stephen Aron. "From Borderlands to Borders: Empires, Nation-States, and the Peoples in Between in North American History." *American Historical Review* 104, no. 3 (June 1999): 814-841.

Bezis-Selfa, John. "A Tale of Two Ironworks: Slavery, Free Labor, Work, and Resistance in the Early Republic." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 56, no. 4 (October 1999): 677-700.

Blessing, Tim H. "The Upper Juniata Valley." In *Beyond Philadelphia: The American Revolution in the Pennsylvania Hinterland* edited by John B. Frantz and William Pencak. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1998.

Boydston, Jeanne. “The Woman Who Wasn’t There: Women’s Market Labor and the Transition to Capitalism in the United States.” *The Journal of the Early Republic* 16, no. 2 (Summer 1996): 183-206.

Burns, Edward M. “Slavery in Western Pennsylvania.” *Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine* 8, no. 4, (October 1925): 204-214.

Clemens, Paul G. E. “The Consumer Culture of the Middle Atlantic, 1760-1820.” *The William and Mary Quarterly* 62, no. 4 (October 2005): 577-624.

Davis, David Brion. “Looking at Slavery from Broader Perspectives.” *The American Historical Review* 105, no. 2 (April 2000): 452-466.

Dunn, Richard S. “Black Life in the Chesapeake, 1776-1810.” In *Slavery and Freedom in the Age of the American Revolution* edited by Ira Berlin and Ronald Hoffman. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1986.

Fogel, Robert William and Stanley L. Engerman. “Philanthropy at Bargain Prices: Notes on the Economics of Gradual Emancipation.” In *The Journal of Legal Studies* 3, no. 2 (June 1974): 377-401.

Goloboy, Jennifer L. “The Early American Middle Class.” *Journal of the Early Republic* 44, no. 2 (Winter 2005): 537-545.

Hartigan-O’Connor, Ellen. “Gender’s Value in the History of Capitalism.” *Journal of the Early Republic* 36, no. 4 (Winter 2016): 613-635.

Hunter, Brooke. “Creative Destruction: The Forgotten Legacy of the Hessian Fly.” *The Economy of Early America: Historical Perspectives and New Directions* edited by Cathy Matson. Philadelphia: Penn State University Press, 2006.

_____. “Wheat, War, and the American Economy during the Age of Revolution.” *The William and Mary Quarterly* 62, no. 3 (July 2005): 505-526.

Kaye, Anthony E. “Modernity in the Nineteenth-Century South and the Atlantic World.” *The Journal of Southern History* 75, no. 3 (August 2009): 627-650.

Kornblith, Gary J. “Introduction to the Symposium on Class in the Early Republic.” *Journal of the Early Republic* 44, no. 2 (Winter 2005): 523-526.

Main, Jackson Turner. “Government by the people: the American Revolution and the democratization of the legislature.” *William and Mary Quarterly* 23, no. 3 (July 1966): 391-407.

Martin, Jonathan. *Divided Mastery: Slave Hiring in the American Mountain South*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004.

McCoy, Michael B. "Forgetting Freedom: White Anxiety, Black Presence, and Gradual Abolition in Cumberland County, Pennsylvania, 1780-1838." *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 136, no. 2 (April 2012): 141-170.

Miller, Steven F. "Plantation Labor Organization and Slave Life on the Cotton Frontier: The Alabama-Mississippi Black Belt, 1815-1840." In *Cultivation and Culture: Labor and the Shaping of Slave Life in the Americas* edited by Ira Berlin and Philip D. Morgan. Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia, 1993.

Osborne, Christopher M. "Invisible Hands: Slaves, Bound Laborers, and the Development of Western Pennsylvania, 1780-1820." *Pennsylvania History: A Journal of Mid-Atlantic Studies* 72, no. 1 (Winter 2005): 77-99.

Rees, Charles A. "Remarkable Evolution: The Early Constitutional History of Maryland." *University of Baltimore Law Review* 36, no. 2 (Winter 2007): 217-270.

Rockman, Seth. "Class and the History of Working People in the Early Republic." *Journal of the Early Republic* 44, no. 2 (Winter 2005): 527-535.

_____. "Land is Liberty and Slaves: The Great Contradiction." *OAH Magazine of History* 19, no. 3, Market Revolution (May 2005): 8-11.

Rood, Daniel B. "An International Harvest: The Second Slavery, The Virginia-Brazil Connection, and the Development of McCormick's Reaper." In *Slavery's Capitalism: A New History of American Economic Development* edited by Sven Beckert and Seth Rockman. Philadelphia: The University of Philadelphia Press, 2016.

Rosenthal, Caitlin. "Slavery's Scientific Management: Masters and Managers." In *Slavery's Capitalism: A New History of American Economic Development* edited by Sven Beckert and Seth Rockman. Philadelphia: The University of Philadelphia Press, 2016.

Ryerson, Richard Alan. "Republican Theory and Partisan Reality in Revolutionary Pennsylvania: Toward a New View of the Constitutionalist Party." In *Sovereign States in an Age of Uncertainty* edited by Ronald Hoffman and Peter J. Albert. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1981.

Schocket, Andrew M. "Thinking about Elites in the Early Republic." *Journal of the Early Republic* 44, no. 2 (Winter 2005): 547-555.

Shirk, Jr., Willis L. "Testing the Limits of Tolerance: Blacks and the Social Order in Columbia, Pennsylvania, 1800-1851." *Pennsylvania History* 60, no 1 (January 1993): 35-50

Steiner, Bernard C. "Western Maryland in the Revolution." *John Hopkins University Press in Historical and Political Science* XX, no. 1. Edited by J. H. Hollander, J. M. Vincent and W. W. Willoughby. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1902.

Potter, John E. “The Pennslyvania and Virginia Boundary Controvery.” *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 38, no. 4 (1914): 407-426.

Wilson, Thomas M. and Hastings Donnan, “Nation, state and identity in international borders.” In *Border Identities: Nation and State at International Frontiers* edited by Thomas M. Wilson and Hastings Donnon. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Wolff, Wendy. *"Case 1: Albert Gallatin."* Senate Election, Expulsion and Censure Cases from 1793 to 1990. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1995.

Wood, Joseph S. *“The Idea of the National Road.”* The National Road edited by Karl B. Raitz. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1996.

Wright, Robert E. *“Capitalism and the Rise of the Corporation Nation*.” In Capitalism Takes Command: The Social Transformation of Nineteenth Century America edited by Michael Zakim and Gary J. Kornblith. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012.

Thesis and Dissertations

Kessel, Elizabeth August. “Germans on the Maryland Frontier: A Social History of Frederick County, Maryland, 1730-1800, Volume I.” PhD dissertation. Rice University, 1981.

Kvach, John F. “Wheat, Wealth, and Western Maryland: The Growth and Evolution of Flower Milling in Frederick County, Maryland, 1748-1789.” Master’s Thesis, West Virginia University, 2002.